THE

TÂITTIRÎYA-PRÂTIÇÂKHYA,

WITH ITS COMMENTARY,

THE TRIBHÂSHYARATNA:

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.

BY

WILLIAM D WHITNEY,
PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE

[FROM THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY, VOL IX, 1871]

NEW HAVEN
FOR THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
PRINTED BY TUTTLE, MOREHOUSE AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS TO YALE COLLEGE
MDCCCLXXI

SOLD BY THE SOCIETY'S AGENTS
NEW YORK B WESTERMANN & CO, 471 BROADWAY,
LONDON TRÜBNER & CO, AND WILLIAMS & NORGATE,
LEIPZIG F A BROCKHAUS.

THE TÂITTIRÎYA-PRÂTIÇÂKHYA,

WITH ITS COMMENTARY,

THE TRIBHÂSHYARATNA

—

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE manuscript material on which is founded this edition of the Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya and Tribhâshyaratna is as follows.

1. T. A copy of the text of the treatise alone, in a modern hand, on light-colored paper. It was sent me by Prof. Fitz Edward Hall, from Benares, in 1857, and appears to be a copy made for him from some older manuscript; but it contains no intimation of its own date or of that of its original, presenting at the end, in place of the usual colophon, the beginning of a list of words which in *pada*-text show a final *n*. It is distinctly and correctly written. On the back is inscribed "Krishna-yajuh-prátis'ákhya, by Kártikeya." On what ground this ascription of authorship is made, I do not know; it does not, so far as I am aware, find support from any other quarter.

2. W. A copy of the text and commentary together, each separate rule being followed by its own comment. This manuscript, like the preceding, I owe to the kindness of Prof. Hall. It is handsomely written, in a large clear hand, and fills 146 leaves (numbered 1–89, 100, 1–56), measuring about four and a half by nine and a half inches. To the end of 25*a*, seven lines are written on a page; thenceforward, nine lines. It has no statement of scribe, place, or date; but I imagine that a final leaf, with the end of the colophon, had been lost or destroyed some time before it was sent to me. The part remaining reads as follows: *çrîkrshnârpabhastu çrîkâlabhâiravârpanamastu om yâyakâmdauvidhâyordhvam rshayo rshayo rshih ity âçîsrâçîmakâpûrvam rsham ce ti srutam-tratâ 1 kramyâdhvano bhavaty agre pâvako rpayatîti ca*. This just fills up the leaf, but another hand has written below, at its edge, what purports to be the ending of the second verse: *rsha-*

yemagra ity evâpy agra ity âdi lupyate 2, and has added, as final benediction, *çrîviçveçvara uprasanna*

This is a virgin manuscript, containing neither erasures, insertions, nor alterations Considering that it thus presents every first fault of its scribe unamended, it is very good and correct Through the first twelve chapters, the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya are distinguished from the commentary by being rubbed over with a red powder

3 **B** This authority comes from the west of India, where (see Dr Bühler, in Zeitsch Deut Morg Ges, xxii 319) the Tribhâshyaratna is said to be not very rare From a manuscript there collected, a copy was made under direction of Dr Bühler for the Berlin library, and forwarded to Prof Weber, at whose friendly suggestion and instance it was transcribed for me, in roman letters, by Dr Siegfried Goldschmidt, to whom I desire here to express my gratitude for a service so valuable and so kindly rendered The manuscript contains more inaccuracies of reading than any of the others which I have used, yet they are in the main superficial, and the text given is a pretty complete and correct one

4 **O** Through the kind offices of Prof Max Müller, I have been enabled to procure a collation (made with a copy of my own manuscript, "W") of the incomplete Oxford manuscript (MS Bodl W 478), first described by Roth (Zur Lit und Gesch des Weda, pp 54, 62 seq), and used also by Weber (Ind Stud iv 77 seq) It begins in the middle of the comment upon iii 12, thus lacking somewhat less than a quarter of the entire work

5 **G** This is a romanized copy of a manuscript which belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and is written on strips of palm leaf, in the Grantham character The copy was made for me by Dr Julius Eggeling, who has thus laid me under deep obligation, and contributed most essentially to the success of my work Hardly less than to him is my indebtedness to Dr Reinhold Rost, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, who notified me of the existence of the manuscripts in the Society's library soon after their discovery, and who suggested and aided their transcription There are doubtless few other Sanskritists in Europe, besides these gentlemen, to whom works written in the southern Indian characters are not sealed books, and there can be none, I am sure, who evince a more liberal readiness to make their peculiar knowledge of service to the rest The catalogue which Dr Rost is preparing to publish of the Royal Asiatic Society's collection of manuscripts will give such other particulars respecting age, condition, etc, as I am compelled here to omit

6 **M** The library of the same Society also contains a second copy of the Prâtiçâkhya and its commentary, written on paper, in the Malayâlam character Of this, Dr Eggeling has taken the pains to note the various readings as compared with the Grantham manuscript, in his transcript of the latter

Both these manuscripts from southern India are so arranged

that the rules of the Prâtiçakhya are given first, in a body, and are followed by the commentary, also in bulk

As regards the text of the Prâtiçâkhya itself, all these authorities agree very closely there are but two or three cases of well-established variations of reading among them In respect to the text of the commentary, their accordance, as was to be expected, is much less they fall, in fact, into three well-marked classes, or, as one might say, present three different recensions of the work The two codices belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society, the Grantham ("G") and the Malayalam ("M"), stand in the nearest possible relation to one another, having almost all their errors, omissions, and orthographical peculiarities in common, and only by comparatively rare and inconspicuous differences proved not to be copied the one from the other My own manuscript ("W") and that sent by Dr Buhler from Bombay ("B") also offer substantially the same text, although their differences are much more frequent, and of a more important character, than those of G and M As for the Oxford manuscript ("O"), it is, in its earlier portions, pretty closely accordant with W and B, having an especially near relationship to B, with whose slight variations of the text given by W it almost uniformly agrees, later, however, it strikes off upon a track of its own, and comes to differ from both the other recensions in a much greater degree than they differ between themselves

Such being the case, I have thought it best to adopt for publication the version offered by W, partly because this is the only one for which I possess an original manuscript (and a tolerably old and correct one), partly because it is, upon the whole, better supported than that of G and M—which, as I have shown above, can hardly be reckoned, both together, as constituting more than a single manuscript I have accordingly, avoiding the making up of an eclectic text from the various recensions, followed W as closely as I could, and especially, when it was supported by the joint authority of B and O, or of B alone—thus sometimes, undoubtedly, rejecting an intrinsically preferable and perhaps more original reading given by one or another of the remaining authorities, if that offered by W was of a character to be endured At the end of the comment to each rule are given the various readings of all the manuscripts, with sufficient fullness, I hope, to answer the desirable ends of critical comparison Obvious and trifling errors of transcription, of course, I have not noted, but only those which made a false reading or tended to become such I have been most liberal in overlooking the blunders of B, as being, on the whole, of least consequence.

In regard, however, to the two matters of punctuation and euphonic combination, I have taken liberties with the text of which I have given no account The various manuscripts are in no slight degree discordant with one another, inconsistent with themselves, and careless of the requirements of the sense, in the use they make of the signs of interpunction they offer absolutely

no standard to follow For the occurrence of the signs as printed, therefore, I am alone responsible, and no one who can anywhere make a better division of clauses than I have made need be restrained from so doing by the belief that he is running counter to manuscript authority Again, I have (except in certain cases at the end of a cited rule or passage, where a reference follows) put all the words of the commentary in euphonic combination according to the usual rules, while in the manuscripts (as is common in exegetical writings) they are very frequently, for the sake of greater clearness, separated from one another * Here, too, the usage of the various authorities is too discordant and irregular to be followed And to report their readings in these two particulars would burden the critical notes with a mass of useless and wearisome details

In the same manner are treated such orthographical peculiarities of the several manuscripts as that G and M regularly write a final sibilant instead of *visarjanîya* before an initial sibilant, and often, where a *m* is assimilated to a following mute, write the nasal mute corresponding to the latter, instead of *anusvâra* Moreover, in the representation of the nasal sounds, by the nasal consonants, *anusvâra* (ṅ̆), or *m*, I have followed a consistent method, with disregard of the manuscript usage

The text given at the foot of the page contains the whole comment, with two exceptions citations from the Taittirîya-Sanhitâ, being written out in full, with references, in the notes to the rules, are indicated below only by first words or letters, with signs of omission added, and again, where lists of affected words are given in a rule, in euphonic combination, and repeated, separate, at the beginning of the comment, they are replaced by signs of omission, as having been sufficiently presented uncombined in the translation of the rule Errors of reading in the cited passages themselves are passed without notice, unless of such importance as to cast doubt upon the identity of the passage, but, on the other hand, the frequent differences of the versions as regards the extent of the illustrative passage cited are fully noted in the sequel of the reference

I have preferred, instead of giving an express and direct translation of the commentary, to work its substance fully into my own notes upon the rules, somewhat as in my edition of the Atharva Prâtiçâkhya (Journ Am Or Soc'y, Vol vii, 1862) The different conditions of the case, however, impress quite a different character upon the present work The completeness and elaborateness of the Tribhâshyaratna make its working-up by far the larger and more important part of what is to be done in illustration of the Prâtiçâkhya Possessing no *index verborum* to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, nor even a manuscript of its *pada*-text, I have not been able to try the Prâtiçâkhya by it with anything like the same

* Thus, to instance an extreme case, at the end of the comment on iv 10, the manuscripts read (for once, with almost perfect unanimity) *ingyasya antah ingyântah na ingyântah aningyântah*

thoroughness as in the case of the similar treatise to the Atharvan What could be done in the way of testing and supplementing the rules given, by a careful reading and excerption of the Sanhitâ in a single good *samhitâ*-manuscript (also procured for me in India by Dr Hall, and with one or two slight deficiencies in it made up from Berlin, by Prof Weber), I have endeavored to do I have been able to refer points of interest connected with the text, in its *samhitâ* or *pada* readings, to friends in Europe owning or having access to fuller manuscript material, namely to Professors Weber of Berlin and Haug of Munchen, and have received from them important aid, which I desire here gratefully to acknowledge Of references to the teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas I have been much more sparing in this than in the former work, in order to avoid repetition and, for the same reason, some matters of theory which were pretty fully discussed there receive here a more compendious treatment The present work, in short, to a certain extent presupposes the other—not, however, in such a manner or degree as should interfere with its independence and separate intelligibility

In making reference to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, I have used only three principal numbers, to designate book, chapter, and section, or *kânda*, *praçna*, and *anuvâka* The further division of the sections or *anuvâkas*, where they are of more considerable length, into parcels of fifty words each, is so artificial, destructive of the natural connection of passages, detrimental to the proper phonetic form of the text, and wholly ignored by the Prâtiçâkhya (see notes to the rules of chapter iii), that I have preferred to express it by the use of "superior" figures attached to that which indicates the *anuvâka* Of course, where such attached figure is wanting, the *anuvâka* is to be understood as composed of a single division

In the notes of various readings, each figure refers only to the single word to which it is attached, unless a passage of more than one word is included between two repetitions of the same figure, in which case the reference figure, in the notes, is put within parentheses The abbreviation "om" means 'omit,' and "ins" means 'insert'

In all transliterated passages of Sanskrit, a colon stands in place of a single stroke of interpunction, and a full stop in place of a double stroke The general method of transliteration is the same with that which I have hitherto used in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, it will be sufficiently understood from the alphabet given in the note to i 1 (p 10)

CHAPTER I

CONTENTS 1–11, enumeration and classification of sounds composing the alphabet, 12–14, surd and sonant consonants, 15, list of prepositions, 16–21, 27, names of letters and classes of letters, 22–24, 28, terminology of cited words, etc, 25, 26, 29, 30, respecting the interpretation of rules, 31–37, quantity of simple sounds, 38–40, the three accents, 41–47, details respecting the circumflex accent, 48, 49, compound words, 50–53, respecting cited words, 54–55, words consisting of a single vowel, 56–61, further specifications respecting the interpretation of rules

THE commentator begins his work with a couple of rather awkwardly-constructed verses, as follows "I, bowing low with devoted affection to the two feet of Ganeça, as also to the *gurus* and to divine Voice, shall proceed to utter this comment, which, made upon examination of the exposition of the Prâtiçâkhya given by Vararuci etc, shines, a Treasure of Threefold Comment (*tribhâshyaratna*), approved of Brahmans" He adds an exposition of their meaning, explaining *giram devîm*, 'divine Voice,' by *vâgdevîm*, 'Goddess of Voice,' and *bhûsura*, 'Brahman' (literally 'earth-god'), by *vidvat*, 'learned man, sage' On *lakshana*, which, as name of a comment, is least in accordance

---

[1]*bhaktiyuktah pranamyâ 'ham ganeçacaranadvayam*
gurûn api giram[2] *devîm idam vakshyâmi lakshanam* 1
vyâkhyânam prâtiçâkhyasya vîkshya vâraruciâdikam[3]
krtam tribhâshyaratnam yad bhâsate bhûsurapriyam 2

çlokayor anayor ayam[4] *arthah bhaktiyukto 'ham ganeçacaranadvayam gurûn giram*[5] *api devîm* [6]*vâgdevîm ity arthah tâm ca*[6] *pranamya lakshanam idam vakshyâmi yat*[7] *lakshanam tribhâshyaratnanâmakam bhûsurapriyam vidvatpriyam bhâsate kîdrçam lakshanam prâtiçâkhyasya vyâkhyânarûpakam*[8] *vârarucâdikam*[9] *bhâshyajâtam vîkshya*[10] *nyûnâtirekaparihârena krtam viracitam âdiçabdenâ "treyamâhisheyâu grhyete ata eva tribhâshyaratnam iti nâmna upapattih trayânâm bhâshyânâm samâhâras tribhâshyam tasya*[11] *ratnam bhûshanam*

[1] W prefaces with *çrîganeçâya namah çrîganeçâ prasanno 'stu om* B prefaces with *çrîganeçâya namah çrîsarasvatyai namah çrîdattânnayâya namah* and the additional verse

çuklâmbaradharam devam çaçivarnam caturbhujam
prasannavadanam dhyâyet sarvavighnopaçântaye 1

'The white raiment-bearing god, moon hued, four armed, propitious-faced, must one meditate on, in order to the surcease of all disturbance" It then numbers the other verses "2" and '3," but proceeds to confess the ungenuineness of the inserted verse by reading, like the other MSS, *anayoh çlokayoh*

[2] G M *giran* [3] B *var* [4] G M om [5] G M *giram* [6] G M om [7] G M *tai* [8] G M *-rupam*, B *purvakam* [9] B *var*, W *ka* [10] G M *samîkshya* [11] W om

with common usage, he makes no remark. To *vîkshya*, 'having examined,' he adds *nyûnâtirekuparihârena*, 'with avoidance of deficiency and redundancy.' The "etc." after "Vararuci" is declared to refer to Âtreya and Mâhisheya, these three being the authorities upon which the present work is founded, and from which it derives its name. Vararuci and Mâhisheya are, indeed, often (about ten times each: see Index) referred to in the sequel, and their discordant views sometimes set forth and discussed. Âtreya has only once (under v. 1) the honor of being mentioned. Who is the digester of their three works, and author of the present commentary, which has taken their place and crowded them out of existence, we are not informed; nor, so far as I am aware, has any evidence bearing upon the point been anywhere brought to knowledge. Notice of the different authorities cited by our commentator will be put together in an additional note at the end of this work, for the sake of the light cast by them upon his age.

अथ वर्णसमाम्नायः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now the list of sounds.

The commentator first gives himself a great deal of trouble to explain the meaning of *atha*, 'now,' in the rule. He quotes Amara's definition of *atho* and *atha* (Amarakosha iii. 4. 32. 8, p. 349 of Deslongchamps's edition), and points out that, as a variety of meanings is there attributed to *atha*, it is necessary to fix upon a single meaning for it here. In the first place, then, a propitiatory significance is claimed for it, by reason of its equivalence with *om*, "since the Çikshâ-makers declare, '*om* and *atha* are deemed propitiatory.'" Or, again, it indicates something coming next after another, "the implication being that, next after the reading of the Veda, one should gain a knowledge of the *lakshana*: there hav-

1. *mañgalânantarârambhapraçnakârtsnyeshv atho athe 'ti mañgalâdyanekârthatvâd athaçabdasyâ 'rthanirnayârtham eko 'rtho[1] niçcetavyah: tatra prathamam tâvan mañgalârthatvam ucyate: tasya pranavasâdharmyât: tathâ hi samâcakshate çikshâkârâh[2]:*

omkâraç câ 'thaçabdaç ca mañgalâv iti kîrtitâv

iti. âho[3] svid ânantaryârthatâ[4]: vedâdhyayanânantaram lakshanajñânam kuryâd iti sâpekshatvâl lakshanasya pûrvam vedâdhigame saty atha lakshanaparîkshâvasarah. atha vâ 'dhikârârtho 'thaçabdah: tv athai 've 'ti vinivartakâdhikârakâvadhârakâh (xxii. 6) iti vidyamânatvât. atha varnasamâmnâyah pâthakramo[5] 'dhikriyata iti sûtrânvayah. sam ity ekîbhâve: âñ iti maryâdâyâm: mnâya ity ânupûrvyeno 'padeçah[6]: ekîbhûtâ akârâdayo varnâh svarabhaktiparyavasânâ ânupûrvyena pûrvaih çishtâir[7] upadishtâh.

ing been study of the Veda before the *lakshana*, now comes the occasion for the investigation of the *lakshana*." Here, *lakshana* appears to be used to designate the Prâtiçâkhya itself, as above it denoted the commentary to the latter. Once more, *atha* is declared to have the force of an introduction or heading, according to rule xxii 6, below: "*tu*, *atha*, and *eva* are respectively exceptive, introductory, and limitative," and the connection of the rule is that *now* the ' ; of sounds, the order of reading (*pâthakrama*), is made the subject of treatment.

The composition of *samâmnâya*, 'list, rehearsal,' is next pointed out, and the word is stated to mean "the collective sounds, beginning with *a* and ending with the *svarabhakti*, in their order, as taught by former learned men."

The catalogue itself follows, as understood by the commentator to be taught or implied in the rules of the treatise. First come the vowels, of which only sixteen are reckoned (see rule 5, below): *a*, *i*, and *u* have each a short, a long, and a protracted value, *r* only a short and a long, *l* only a short (W and B take the pains to write a figure 2 after the long *r*, and a 1 after the *l*, to point out clearly the number of *moras* they respectively contain, and B adds after the *âi* and *âu* a 2, for the same purpose); second, the twenty-five mutes (see rule 7); third, the four semivowels (rule 8); and fourth, the six spirants (rule 9). This makes fifty-one sounds, clearly specified and counted in their order in the next succeeding rules. Of the rest, there is no so direct enumeration; the commentator has to infer them from their recognition by rules found in later portions of the treatise. Thus, he finds *anusvâra* acknowledged as an alphabetic element in rule 34 of this chapter, which teaches that it has the quantity of a short vowel; for, he says, "since it is made the substrate of a specific quantity, it is itself a concrete thing, and not, like nasalization, a quality." A passage from the Çikshâ, it is true, appears inconsistent with this, but finds its sufficient explanation in the circumstance that that work includes in one expression the concrete thing and its quality. The cited passage is not to be found in the known text of the

---

tathâ hi a â â3 i î i3 u û û3 r r̂ l e âi o âu iti svarâh shodaça ka kha ga gha ña ca cha ja jha ña ta tha da dha na ta tha da dha na pa pha ba bha ma iti sparçâh pañcavinçatih ya ra la va iti catasro 'ntasthâh ça sha sa ha hka[8] *hpa*[9] *iti shad ûshmânah. anusvâraç ca* (i 34) *iti sûtrenâ 'nusvâra uktah kâlaviçeshâçrayatvâd asâu* [11]*dharmî na tv*[10] *anunâsikavad*[11] *dharmah. vidher* [12] *madhyasthanâsikya*[13] *iti çikshâvacane*[14] *sati*[15] *dharmadharminor abhedavivakshayo 'papadyate atha visarjanîyah* (viii 5) *ity anena*[16] *visarjanîya uktah nâsikâvivaranâd ânunâsikyam* (ii 52) *ity anena*[16] *rañga uktah prktasvarât paro lo dam* (xiii 16) *ity anena*[16] *lakâra uktah sparçâd anuttamâd* (xxi.12) *iti catvâro yamâ uktâh · rephoshmasamyoge rephasvarabhaktir* (xxi.15) *iti svarabhaktir uktâ anena kramena*

Çikshâ (and the same is the case with several of the passages quoted later see the additional notes) it is given again, with more fullness, under viii 15 Next, for the *visarjaniya*, which our Prâtiçâkhya does not count among the spirants, is given as authority rule 5 of the eighth chapter, a rule introductory to the euphonic changes of a final *h* The commentator brings in as next constituent of the alphabet an element which he calls *rañga*, and for which he cites the rule (ii.52) that "nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nasal passage" The word *rañga*, 'coloring,' though a common name for the nasal tinge of utterance, is not found in our Prâtiçâkhya, nor even used in the commentary excepting here and under ii 52 What is described in the latter rule is in fact a "quality" (*dharma*), and not a "qualified" or concrete thing (*dharmin*), and its inclusion in the alphabet would stultify the argument with which the inclusion of *anusvâra* was but just now supported It would seem that the commentator ought to be aiming here at the *nâsikya*, or euphonic insertion between *h* and a following nasal mute, and should quote for it rule xxi 14, he does not otherwise take account of it in his list, while yet it is precisely as well entitled to a place there as are the *yamas* The nasalized semivowels, it is true, into which *n* and *m* are directed to be converted before *y*, *l*, *v* (v 26–8), are also left out of the enumeration, unless we suppose the *rañga* to be meant to apply to their nasality, and I think it altogether likely that the commentator had them in view in its definition but this is only avoiding one difficulty by running into two worse ones—namely, by omitting the *nâsikya*, and by reckoning as a member of the alphabet what is really only one of the constituent elements of certain sounds Further, rule xiii 16 is made the warrant for the lingual *l*, rule xxi 12 for the four *yamas*, and rule xxi 15, finally, for the *svarabhakti* and the conclusion is reached that "by this process, the number of sixty is clearly derivable from the rules themselves as that of the letters in the Yajur-Veda"

---

yâjurvedikavarnânâm[17] *shashtisamkhyâ sûtrata eva vispashtâ drashtavyâ nanu*

trishashtiç catuhshashtir vâ varnâh çambhumate[18] *matâh*

iti çikshâvacane sati katham shashtisamkhyâ niyamyate etal[19] *lâukikavâidikasarvavarnavishayam*[20] *iti*[21] *çikshâvacane na virodhah atra tu*[22] *sûtrâir etâvatâm varnânâm*[23] *evo 'palambhâd esha eva*[24] *nirnayo varnitah*[25]

varnânâm samâmnâyo varnasamâmnâyah

(1) G M *mangalâdyanekârtho* [2] W G M *çiksh* G and M always write *çîkshâ*, B and O always *çikshâ*, W has *çi* only in one other place (under xiv 28) [3] W B *aho* [4] G M *ryatâ*, W adds *vâ* [5] G M *pathe kramo* [6] W B om [7] W *çishyâir* [8] B *shka* [9] B *shpa* [10] G M om (11) B *dharmânatvâd anunâsikah* [12] G ins *âdharma* [13] G M *-kâd* [14] G M *nam* [15] B om., G M *tu* [16] B G M om [17] W *-vâid-* [18] B *amçumate* [19] G M. *tal* [20] G M *savarnavarna-* [21] G. M ins *na.* [22] G M om [23] G M om [24] G M om [25] B *nirnîtah*

An objection is now raised and removed "Considering that the Çikshâ says 'the letters are regarded as sixty-three or sixty-four, in the opinion of Çambhu' (Çikshâ, verse 3, see Weber's edition of the treatise, in his Indische Studien, iv 348–9), how is the number sixty established? Answer there is no inconsistency with the *dictum* of the Çikshâ, seeing that the latter has in view the whole body of sounds, as used both in the Veda and in common life, while here the determination (of sixty) is derived from the assumption of just so many letters by the rules of the treatise"

The alphabetic scheme is, then, as follows

Vowels	simple,	*a â â3 i î î3 u û û3*	9	
	impure and diphthongs,	*r r̂ l e âi o âu*	7	16
Mutes	guttural,	*k kh g gh ṅ*	5	
	palatal,	*c ch j jh ñ*	5	
	lingual,	*t th d dh n*	5	
	dental,	*t th d dh n*	5	
	labial,	*p ph b bh m*	5	25
Semivowels,		*y r l v*		4
Spirants,		*χ ç sh s φ h*		6
Anusvâra,		*ň*		1
Visarjanîya,		*h*		1
Lingual *l*,		*l*		1
Nâsikya,		(not written)		1
Yamas,		do		4
Svarabhakti,		do		1
	whole number of letters,			60

With the exception of the nasal *y, l, v*, already referred to, this list includes all the alphabetic sounds treated of by the Prâtiçâkhya For what concerns the peculiarities of their character or classification, see the special rules of which they are the subject, as also, for the differences between the teachings of this and of the other kindred treatises with reference to them Only the Vâjasaneyi-Prâtiçâkhya includes in its text a complete list and enumeration of letters, and that by an afterthought, in a later and less genuine chapter (viii 1–31)

अथ नवादितः समानाक्षराणि ॥२॥

2 Now the nine at the beginning are simple vowels.

---

2 *athe 'ti samjñâdhikârârthah asmin*[1] *varnasamâmnâya âdita ârabhya nava varnâh samânâksharasamjñâ bhavanti* [2]*yathâ a â â3 i î î3 u û û3*[2] *samjñâyâh*[3] *prayojanam dîrgham samânâkshare savarnapare* (x 2) *ity âdi. nanv îdrçî mahatî samjñâ kimarthâ*[4] *çikshâdiçâstraprasiddhyanurodhâye*[5]*ti brûmah*

[1] B *tasmin* (2) W B *a â â3 ity âdi* [3] G M *jñâ* [4] G M *-tham* [5] G M om. *di-*

Literally, 'are homogeneous syllables,' *samânâkshara* and its correlative *samdhyakshara*, 'syllable of combination,' being the current names for simple vowel and for diphthong, the latter, however, is not used in this treatise The nine intended are, as shown in the preceding list, *a â â3 i î î3 u û û3* The *r* and *l* vowels are denied the quality of simplicity or homogeneity, although their structure as composed of heterogeneous elements is not further described, the Rik Pr (xiii 14), the Vâj Pr (iv 145), and the Ath Pr (i 37–9) give the details of their formation, while nevertheless the two first expressly include *r* and *r̂* among the *samânâksharas* (omitting *l*, apparently, because no case anywhere occurs that should test its quality), and the same classification is inferribly recognized by the last

The commentator explains the *atha* of this rule as signifying the introduction of the subject of names or technical appellations (*samjñâ*), and cites, as example of the use of the term, rule x 2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel Finally, the unwieldiness of the long word *samânâkshara* striking his mind, he asks "why such a big name?" and relieves himself by the answer, "we say, in order to correspond with the established usage of the Çikshâ and other text-books" The Çikshâ as we know it, it may be remarked, does not employ the term

द्वेद्वे सवर्णे ह्रस्वदीर्घे ॥ ३ ॥

3 Two and two, short and long, are similar

That is to say, as the commentary explains, of these simple vowels, two and two short, two and two long, or a long and a short, are called "similar" The meaning seems rather to be that, of the three triplets which make up the category of simple vowels, the first two in each triplet, the short and the long, will be designated as "similar"—to the exclusion, namely, of the *pluta* or protracted vowels The term is used but once in the treatise (namely in x 2, the rule last above quoted), as applied to vowels, and nothing is practically gained by denying its inclusion of the protracted vowels, since these are specially protected from coalescence by the rule x 24 The *r*-vowels are here again shut out, as in the preceding rule, and, in fact, no case occurs in the Vedic text in which two of them are fused into one

---

3 *teshu*[1] *samânâkshareshu dvedve hrasve dvedve dîrghe*[2] *hrasvadîrghe*[3] *dîrghahrasve vâ 'kshare parasparam savarnasamjñe bhavatah iyam anvarthasamjñâ savarnatvam nâma sâdrçyam ucyate tasmâd akârâdînâm ikârâdibhir na savarnasamjñâçankâ bhinnasthânaprayatnatvâd*[4] *anayoh samjñâyâh prayojanam. dîrghan samânâkshare savarnapare* (x 2) *iti.*

hrasvam ca dîrgham ca hrasvadîrghe

[1] G M *eteshu* [2] G M ins *vâ* [3] B om, G M ins *vâ* [4] B ...

The word translated 'similar' means literally 'of identical color' (i e sound), and is several times applied later to identity of consonantal sound It is, as the commentator points out, a self-explaining term, or one whose application is directly in accordance with its natural meaning (*anvartha*), and hence no suspicion is to be entertained of the inclusion of *a* and *i*, for instance, as "similar," because of their different mode of organic production As example of the use of the term is again cited x 2

न प्लुतपूर्वम् ॥४॥

4 Not so, when a protracted vowel precedes

This is an arbitrary exclusion, made to fit a particular case, which might with more evident propriety have been provided for later, where such cases are under treatment, rather than here in the preliminary definition of terms (compare a somewhat similar case in the Rik Pr, i 1, r 4) The commentator paraphrases the rule "a simple vowel having a protracted one before it is not termed 'similar,'" and goes on to cite and explain in full the case to which it applies In the phrase *ágne íti áha* (vi 5 8[4]), the word *ágne* has its final diphthong protracted, and becomes *ágnā'3i* By the rule (x 2) for the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel, this would then unite with the following word to form *ágnā'3ī' 'ti* The quality of similarity, however, being denied by the present rule to the final *i*, it is treated as a dissimilar vowel, being first converted into *y* by rule x 15, the *y* dropped by x 19, and the coalescence of the remaining *ā3* with the following *i* (as prescribed by x 4) prevented by x 24 thus is assured the reading *ágnā'3 íty āha*

षोडशादितः स्वराः ॥५॥

5 The sixteen at the beginning are vowels

Namely, says the commentator, the sixteen beginning with *a* and ending with *āu* As example of the use of the technical term

---

4 *plutapūrvam samānāksharam savarnasamjñam na bhavati. plutam asmāt pūrvam iti plutapūrvam yathā agnā3 ity āhe 'ty atra dīrghañ samānākshare savarnapare* (x.2) *ity ekādeçah prasaktah tac cā 'nishtam pratishiddhāyām tv evam savarnasamjñāyām pāriçeshyād ivarnokārāu yavakārāv* (x 15) *iti pūrvasye 'kārasya yatvam syāt*[1]. *sa ca yakāro lupyete tv avarnapūrvāu yavakārāv* (x 19) *iti lupyate. yakāre lupte sati ivarnapara ekāram* (x.4) *ity ekārah*[2] *prasaktah: so 'pi*[3] *nishidhyate na plutapragrahāv* (x 24) *ity anena tasmād āgnā3 ity āhe 'ti prasidhyati*[4]

[1] W om [2] G M *ekādeçah* [3] G M *vi* [4] G M *sidhyate*

svara, 'vowel,' he quotes the rule (ix 10) prescribing the conversion of *visarjanîya* into *y* before a vowel

Our Prâtiçâkhya is to be commended for not including in its list of vowels the long *l*, and for postulating no useless protracted forms of *r* and *l*

शेषो व्यञ्जनानि ॥ ६ ॥

6 The rest are consonants

As example of the term *vyañjana*, 'consonant,' rule xxi 1, which pronounces the consonant a member of the adjacent vowel, is cited in the commentary, according to the two manuscripts from northern India, those from the south substitute for it the opening rule of the third chapter, and also omit the explanatory statement "beginning with *k* and ending with *svarabhakti*," which is given by the others

आद्याः पञ्चविंशति स्पर्शाः ॥ ७ ॥

7 The first twenty-five are mutes

The commentator explains "among the consonants, the first twenty-five letters are called mutes" (*sparça*, literally 'contact') The northern manuscripts add, as under the last rule, "beginning with *k* and ending with *m*" It is next pointed out that rules 2 and 5 contain the specification *âditah*, 'at the beginning,' and that the different phraseology of this rule, namely *âdyâh*, 'first,' indicates a difference of meaning it signifies that the sounds referred to

---

5 *varnasamâmnâyasyâ*[1] *"dita ârabhya shodaça varnâh svarasamjñâ bhavanti akâ*r*âdaya âukâraparyantâ ity arthah samjñâyâh prayojanam atha svaraparo yakâram* (ix 10) *ity âdi.*

[1] G M *varnânâm sam-*

6 *svarebhyah çesho varnarâçir vyañjunasamjño bhavati* [1]*kakârâdisvarabhaktiparyantâ ity arthah*[1] *samjñâyâh prayojanam* [2]*vyañjunañ svarâñgam*[2] (xxi 1) *iti*

(1) G M om (2) G M *athâ "dâv uttare vibhâge hrasvam vyañjanapara* (iii 1)

7 *vyañjaneshv âdyâh pañcavinçativarnâ sparçasamjñâ bhavanti* [1]*kakârâdayo makârântâh*[1] [2]*samjñâyâh prayojanam sparça sparçaparah* (xiv 27)[2] *atha navâ "ditah samânâksharâni* (i 2) *shodaçâ "ditah svarâh* (i 5) *itivad âdita iti vaktavya âdyâ iti çabdântaraprayogo 'rthântarasûcakah vyañjaneshv âdyâ na tu svareshv âdyâ iti vijñeyam*[3]

(1) G M om (2) G M remove to end of exposition, and for *sparçaparah* read *sparça ity âdi* [3] G M *jñeyam*

are first among the consonants, not first among the vowels (better, we should say, not first in the whole list) Of this style of interpretation, which forces a special significance into very innocent variations of phraseology, we shall meet with other and more striking examples farther on

Rule xiv 27 is given as instance of the employment of the technical term here defined

पराश्चतस्रो ऽन्तस्थाः ॥ ८ ॥

8 The next four are semivowels

The four semivowels are *y*, *r*, *l*, *v* The rule cited by the commentary in illustration of the use of the term "semivowel" (*antasthā*, i e *antaḥ-sthā*, 'standing between, intermediate [between consonant and vowel]' see note to Ath Pr i 30) is one (v 28) prescribing the treatment of final *m* before an initial semivowel

परे षडूष्माणः ॥ ९ ॥

9 The next six are spirants

Namely, the three sibilants, *ç*, *sh*, and *s*, the *jihvāmūlīya*, *χ*, the *upadhmānīya*, *φ*, and the aspiration, *h* As regards the sounds to which the name *ūshman*, 'flatus,' shall be given, the phonetic treatises are greatly at variance The Vaj Pr (viii 22) limits the class to the sibilants and *h*, the Ath Pr (see note to i 31) apparently adds the guttural and labial spirants and the more indistinct *visarjanīya*, the Rik Pr (i 2), these and the *anusvāra* We have an equal right to be surprised at the inclusion of this last in the class, and at the exclusion from it, by our treatise, of the *visarjanīya*

To instance the employment of "spirant," the comment cites the rule (xiv 16) forbidding the duplication of a spirant before a vowel

स्पर्शानामानुपूर्व्येण पञ्चपञ्च वर्गाः ॥ १० ॥

10 Of the mutes, the successive fives are the series

The commentary paraphrases "among the mutes, five and five sounds, in their order, have the designation 'series,' they begin respectively with *k*, *c*, *ṭ*, *t*, *p*, and end with *ṅ*, *ñ*, *ṇ*, *n*, *m*" This

8. *sparçebhyah pare catvāro varnā antasthāsamjñā bhavanti samjñāyāh prayojanam.* [1]*antasthāparaç ca savarnam anunāsikam* (v 28) *ity ādi*

[1] A *lacuna* in W, extending to the word *prayojanam* in the commentary to the next rule

9 *antasthābhyah pare shad varnā ūshmasamjñā bhavanti samjñāyāh prayojanam ūshmā svaraparah* (xiv.16) *ity ādi*

exposition is in accordance with the requirements of the context, the treatise being here engaged in defining its technical terms Otherwise, we might divide .... *pañca pañcavargâh*, and translate, like the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr (i 2), 'there are five series, of five each'

The illustrative rule (xiv 20) cited in the comment teaches the non-duplication of a mute of the lingual series before one of the dental series

प्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्थोत्तमाः ॥ ११ ॥

11 And are called first, second, third, fourth, and last

Each series of five mutes, that is to say, is composed of a surd, a surd aspirate, a sonant, a sonant aspirate, and a nasal, as *t, th, d, dh, n*, and these classes are named according to their order in the several series The commentator makes no note here of the physical differences of the classes, but says "In each series, the sounds, in their order, are styled first, second, third, fourth, and last Even though a name founded on enumeration obviously belongs to them [is assured them, without a special rule to that effect], yet, for the purpose of denying appellation on the ground of any other enumeration, the technical terms 'first' and so on are prescribed, to enjoin a certain enumeration (?) How so? Why, to establish the designation 'first' and so on for *k* and its successors alone, and to deny to the vowels, semivowels, spirants, etc, designations founded on their enumeration" And he proceeds to cite four rules (ii 9, xiv 12,24, viii 3 but the southern MSS cite v 38 instead of ii 9) as examples of the use of the five terms defined

---

10 *sparçânâm madhya ânupûrvyena pañcapañca varnâ*[1] *vargasamjñâ bhavanti ka-ca-ta-ta-pâdayo*[2] *ña-ña-na-na-mântâ ity arthah samjñâyâh prayojanam* *tavargaç ca tavargaparah* (xiv 20) *iti*[3]

[1] B om [2] G M *pâdyâh* [3] W om the cited rule, G M *ity âdi*

11 *ekâikasmin varge yathâkramena*[1] *varnâh prathamadvitîyatrtîyacaturthottamâsamjñâ bhavanti siddhe 'pi samkhyânimitte nâmani*[2] *samkhyântarânabhidhânârtham*[3] *samkhyântaram*[4] *kathayitum prathamâdisamjñâvidhânam tat katham kakârâdînâm eva*[5] *prathamâdisamjñâpratyayârtham svarântasthoshmaprabhrtishu tatsamkhyâsamjñâpratishedhârtham*[6] *samjñâyâh prayojanam* *prathama ûshmaparo dvitîyam* (xiv 12) *trtîyam svaraghoshavatparah* (viii 3) *hakâro hacaturtheshu* (ii 9)[7] *nâ 'nuttama uttamaparah* (xiv.24)* *ity âdi*

[1] G M *-kramam* [2] G M *nâmni* [3] B *samkhyântarâbh*, G M *samkhyâbh* [4] M *samjñântaram* as to the true reading and interpretation of this clause I am by no means confident [5] G M om [6] G M *tu samkh* [7] G M substitute for this rule part of v 38, viz *prathamapûrvo hakâraç caturtham tasya sasthânam*

The other Prâtiçâkhyas employ the same designations for the mutes (save that the Vâj Pr also calls the nasals *pañcama*, 'fifth'), but without taking the trouble to define them or prescribe their use by a rule

ऊष्मविसर्जनीयप्रथमद्वितीया अघोषाः ॥ १२ ॥

12 The spirants, *visarjanîya*, and the first and second mutes, are surd

The Rik Pr gives (i 2,3) a similar statement, the Ath Pr uses the terms "surd" and "sonant" without defining which consonants form each class, the Vâj Pr (i 50–53) substitutes for the terms arbitrary formulas

The physical peculiarity of the surd utterance is defined in the next chapter (rules 5,10)

The commentator illustrates the use of the term by the rule (ix 2) concerning the treatment of *visarjanîya* before a surd

न हकारः ॥ १३ ॥

13 But not *h*

"*H* is not styled a surd, this is an exception rendered necessary by the circumstance that *h*, being [by i 9] a spirant, would otherwise be included [by the last rule] in the class of surds," says the comment

All the phonetic treatises treat *h* as a sonant For further definition of its character, see rules ii 6,9,46,47, below

व्यञ्जनशेषो घोषवान् ॥ १४ ॥

14 The rest of the consonants are sonant

The commentary enters into a rather lengthy defense of the propriety of this rule, which reads literally as follows "The remainder of the consonants other than the surds is styled sonant Even though, when the surds have already been stated in rule 12, the sonant quality of the rest, on the principle of 'remainder,' is assured—just as, when it is said, 'of Devadatta and Yajñadatta,

---

12 *ûshmânaç ca visarjanîyaç ca prathamadvitîyâç*[1] *câ 'ghoshasamjñâ bhavanti samjñâyâh prayojanam aghoshaparas tasya sasthânam ûshmânam*[2] (ix 2) *ity âdi*[3]

[1] B *prathamaç ca dv* [2] W B omit the last two words of the rule [3] G M om.

13 *na bhavaty aghoshasamjño*[1] *hakârah ûshmatvâd aghoshatve prâpte tadapavâdo 'yam*

[1] W *-jñko*

Devadatta owns no kine,' the conclusion is assured that Yajña-datta is a kine-owner—nevertheless, the indication of the technical term is made in the text-book, for the sake of practical convenience (?) Also, because of the superiority of express mention over inclusion in a remainder Otherwise—the name of surd is denied to *h* by rule 13, nor is *h* sonant, there being no rule to that effect, and so with the rest of the consonants, the vowels are also in like manner not sonant and not surd—this being the case, when the rule shall be given (ix 8) 'also when followed by a sonant,' the doubt would arise, 'followed by a sonant' means followed by what? Let not this be so in this view the present rule is undertaken" It is added "In this rule, the distinctive meaning, in the form of objection and replication, is set forth by Mâhisheya" And the rule ix 8, already referred to, is quoted again by way of illustration of the use of the term "sonant"

The Rik Pr (i 3), after specifying the surd letters, leaves the sonants to be inferred *pâriçeshyât*, 'by the remainder-principle,' as is expressly pointed out in the commentary on the passage (see Regnier's edition, note to rule i.12)

The vowels are not included under the designation *ghoshavant* 'sonant,' although (as is explained in rule ii 8) formed of the same material with the sonant consonants

Our treatise does not, like the other Prâtiçâkhyas (R Pr i 3, V Pr i 54, A. Pr i 10), define the "first" and "third" mutes as *soshman*, 'aspirated'

---

14 *aghoshebhyo* [1] *vyañjanaçesho ghoshavatsamjño bhavati yady apy ûshmavisarjanîyaprathameshv*[2] *aghosheshû 'kteshu vyañjanaçeshasya pâriçeshyâd ghoshavattvam siddham yathâ*[3] *devadattayajñadattayor*[4] *apaçur devadatta ity ukte 'parah paçumân iti siddham tathâ 'pi çâstre samvyavahârârtham*[5] *samjñânirdeçah kriyate pâriçeshyâd api kanthokter viçeshât*[6] *anyathâ na hakârah* (i 13) *iti hakârasyâ 'ghoshasamjñâ nishidhyate nâ 'pi hakâro ghoshavân vidhyabhâvât tathâi 'va vyañjanaçeshah svarâ api tathâ*[7] *na ghoshavanto nâ 'py aghoshâh tathâ sati ghoshavatparaç ca* (ix 8) *iti yatra*[8] *vakshyati tatra*[9] *samdehah syât ghoshavatparo nâma kimpara iti tan mâ bhûd itî 'dam sûtram*[10] *ârabhyate*[11]

vyañjanarûpah çesho vyañjanaçeshah[12]

atra sûtre codyaparihârarûpa[13] *esha viçesho mâhisheyabhâshitah*

samjñâyâh prayojanam ghoshavatparaç ca (ix 8) *ity âdi*

[1] G M ins *'nyo* [2] G M *ûshmavisarjaniye 'ty* [3] B ins *ca* [4] W *dattaithyor* [5] W *samhâr* [6] G M *viçeshatvât* [7] G M om [8] G M *yatrayatra* [9] G M *tatratatra* [10] B *çâstram* [11] G M repeat the rule itself here [12] W om, B adds *yah çeshah* [13] G M om *rupa*

आप्रावोपाभ्यधिप्रतिपरिविनीत्युपसर्गाः ॥ १५ ॥

15 *Â*, *pra*, *ava*, *upa*, *abhi*, *adhi*, *prati*, *pari*, *vi*, *ni*—these are prepositions

These ten words are but half the number which are reckoned as prepositions by the Rik and Vâj Prâtiçakhyas (R Pr xii 6, V Pr vi 24) and by Pânini (see the *gana prâdayah*) The commentator notes the discordance with Pânini, and inquires why the maker of this rule presumingly cuts short the list of prepositions with the word *iti* in it His reply is, that only so many are recognized by the Yajur-Veda Another objection which he raises and removes, arriving at the comfortable conclusion "therefore there is no discordance whatever," I do not see the point of The discordance is a real one, and difficult to explain The term preposition (*upasarga*) is used in three of the rules of the treatise, viz vi 4 (which is the cited instance in the commentary), x 9, and xiv 8 for the bearing of the restriction in number, see the notes on those rules

वर्णः कारोत्तरो वर्णाख्या ॥ १६ ॥

16 A sound followed by *kâra* is the name of that sound

That is, for example, *akâra* is the name of *a*, *ekâra* of *e*, and so on The Vâj Pr (i.37) is the only other treatise which takes the trouble to prescribe this usage, common to them all Our own refers to it also in a later rule (xxii 4) The word *kâra* means 'making, producing' It is in the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya added not only to simple alphabetic sounds (*varna*) as their names, but also to syllables like *ah* and *an* (see below, rules 23, 53), and the

15 .... *ity ete çabdâ upasargasamjñâ bhavanti nanu praparâpasamanvavanirdurvyâñ ityâdi pâninîyâ viçeshena bhananti*[1] *katham atra sûtrakrtâ nirargalam upasargâ itiçabdena samkucitâ ucyante yajurvedavishaya etâvanta eve 'ti mantavyam tarhi praparâpasam*[2] *iti samuccaye viçeshapâthah*[3] *katham upalabhyate*[4] *itiparatvavidhâne tasya tâtparyam na tâ 'pasargasamjñâvidhâne viçeshapâthah*[5] *tasmân na kenacid virodhah. samjñâyâh prayojanam upasarganishpûrvo 'nudâtte pade* (vi 4). *itiçabdah prakâravâcî*

[1] W B and G p m *bhavanti* [2] B *prâpaparâvasam*, G M *prâpasam* [3] G M *viçeshah*, W *viçeshamp* [4] B *lakshyate* [5] W B *viçeshah p*

16 *kârottaro varno varnasyâ 'khyâ bhavati yathâ. athâi 'kârekârâv* (iv 8) *iti*[1] *kâraçabda uttaro yasmâd asâu kârottarah*

[1] G M *ity âdi*

commentator very frequently uses it to make names for brief words, like *ca*

Rule IV 8, respecting *e* and *ī*, is the chosen illustration of the combination here taught

अकारव्यवेतो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥ १७ ॥

17 But with an *a* interposed, in the case of the consonants

That is, the name of *k*, for instance, is (*k-a-kâra*) *kakâra* Compare the equivalent rule, Vâj Pr I 38

The commentator cites rule V 22, respecting the conversion of *t* to *c*

न विसर्जनीयजिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयानुस्वारनासिक्यानाम् ॥ १८ ॥

18 Not of *visarjanîya*, *jihvâmûlîya*, *upadhmânîya*, *anusvâra*, and the *nâsikyas*

The term *nâsikya* designates here, of course, the nasal figments taught in rules XXI 12–14 All these indistinct, hardly articulate, sounds must be spoken of by their descriptive titles, not by any name founded upon their form The commentator explains that the appending of *kâra* to the sounds here specified—which would otherwise be regular, since they come under the category of *varna*, 'alphabetic elements'—is annulled by the rule adding as a reason, that they are nowhere met with thus treated He then

---

17 *akâravyavahito*[1] *varnah kâraçabdottaro vyañjanânâm âkhyâ bhavati yathâ*[2] *takâraç cakâram* (V 22) *ity âdi akârena vyavahito*[3] *'kâravyavetah*

[1] W *vyaveto* [2] W B put this word after the cited rule [3] G M *vyaveto*

18 *visarjanîyâdînâm varnatvâviçeshât kârottaratvam prâptam anena nivartyate na khalu visarjanîyâdînâm kârottaratâ bhavati kutah sarvatra*[1] *prayogânupalambhât nanu yathâ varnah kârottaro varnâkhyâ* (I 16) *iti varnaçabdavâcyasyâi 'va kârottaratvam nakâro nakâram* (VII 1 or XIII 6) *ity âdi na tu vâcakasyâi 'va*[2] *anyathâ varnakâra iti syât tadvad*[3] *visarjanîyâdînâm*[4] *atrâ 'pi vâcyagrahanam eva yuktam nâ 'nyathâ tathâ sati vâcakaparatayâ vararucyâdiviracitam*[5] *udâharanam avasâne ravisarjanîya* (XIV 15) *ity âdy aruciram iti cet. mâi 'vam mansthâh vâcyânâm*[6] *kevalânâm aprayogâd atra vâcyavâcakayor abhedavivakshayâ sûtrasaranir ity udâharanagamanikâ*[7]

[1] G M. ins. *tathâ* [2] G M om *eva* [3] W. *tad.* [4] G M ins *ity* [5] W B *vararucâd-*, G M *vâraručâd-* [6] W B *vacyadinâm* [7] W *-nam gam-*

goes on to raise and refute a very subtile and hair-splitting objection In rule 16, he says, *kâra* is prescribed to be added not to the vocable (*vâcaka*) *varna*, 'sound,' itself, but only to the thing designated (*vâcya*) by that vocable, so likewise in this rule it is proper to understand by *visarjanîya* etc the things designated by those words, and nothing else (and hence, the rule must not be interpreted as implying that *visarjanîya* and the other names given are, in default of those formed with *kâra*, the accepted designations for the sounds in question) This being the case, the illustrations given under the rule by Vararuci and others—namely, rule xiv 15, speaking of *r* and "*visarjanîya*" as not liable to duplication—is an unsuitable one Such is the objection The reply is you must not think so, since the sounds designated by the terms in the rule are actually nowhere employed by themselves (as designations), the rule simply intends to include designation and thing designated in one expression, and the quoted example is proper enough

रेफस्तु रस्य ॥१९॥

19 Of *r*, however, *epha* forms the name

That is to say, the technical designation of *r* is *repha*, *ra* being also admitted, by rule 21, below *rakâra* is not found anywhere in the Hindu grammatical literature This peculiarity of treatment of *r*, as compared with the other consonants, is to be paralleled with the way in which it is written in consonant groups, almost as if a vowel.

The Vâj Pr has an equivalent rule (i.40)

The word *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, according to the commentator, is meant to deny the application to *r* of both the rules 16 and 17 Some, he says, hold that it denies only rule 17, or the insertion of *a* between *r* and the appended *kâra*, but this is wrong, for it would imply that the name of *r* was made sometimes by appending *kâra* and sometimes by appending *epha*, just as an alternation is in fact allowed by rule 21 below between *ra* and *repha*, and exemplified by rules vii 11 and xxi 15, while no

---

19 *rasya tu ephaçabda*[1] *âkhyâ bhavati yathâ rephoshmaparah*[2] (xiii 2) *iti rephasya vyañjanatvâviçeshât prâptam kârottaratvam akâravyavetatvam ca tad ubhayaṁ tuçabdo nivârayati anye tu anyathâ manyante akâravyavetatvam eve 'ti. tad asâdhu tathâ sati kadâcid ephottaratâ*[3] *kadâcit kârottaratâ ce 'ti vikalpah syât yathâ 'kâro vyañjanânâm* (i.21) *iti vidhânâd vikalpah tathâ hi*[4] *rephoshmasamyoge rephasvarabhaktih*[5] (xxi 15) *rashahpûrvo havanî* (vii 11) *ity âdi na tu evam kârottaratvam api vikalpena*[6] *svîkrtam*[7] *kutracit: tasmâd asmadukta eva yuktas tuçabdârthah*

[1] G M *reph-*, and M reads *rephas* in the rule itself [2] W *-shmaçabda* [3] B *rephaksharata*, W *reph-* [4] W B *'pi* [5] W B om [6] G M *naka* [7] G M *tah*

instance of a name formed with *kâra* is anywhere to be met with This is a very easy demolition of a very insignificant man of straw

ह्रस्वो वर्णोत्तरस्त्रयाणाम् ॥ २० ॥

20 The short vowel, with *varna* after it, is the name of the three vowels

The "three vowels" referred to are the three quantities—short, long, and protracted—of the vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, respectively, *varna*, in this case, indicating only the 'color,' or phonetic complexion, of the vowel, without regard to its length The Ath Pr has the same usage of this term, but without defining it by rule As our treatise acknowledges no protracted *r*, and neither a long nor a protracted *l*, it does not admit the compounds *rvarna* and *lvarna* of the other three it frequently avails itself The instance selected by the commentator is rule x 4, which directs the combination of *a* with a following *i*, *î*, *î3* into *e*

अकारो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥ २१ ॥

21 An *a* forms the names of consonants

This rule allows us to call a consonant not only, as prescribed in rules 16 and 17 above, by a name formed by adding *kâra* with *a* interposed, but also by one formed with *a* alone The commentator's example is rule v 22, where *t* and *c* are referred to as *takâra*, *cakâra*, and *ç*, *c* again, and *ch*, as *ça*, *ca*, and *cha* If something merely additional to the *kâra*, instead of alternative with it, were intended in the rule, we are told, rule 17 would be made meaningless But, says an objector, why use *kâra* at all for the purpose, when even along with it the *a* has to be brought into requisition? let this alone furnish the name The reasonableness of the objection is conceded, but the commentator alleges as sufficient justification of the practice followed, that it is in accordance with that of the Çikshâ and other text-books

He continues others assert that the *a* added to a consonant indicates (not that consonant pure and simple, but) a syllable composed of the consonant and any following vowel, as for instance in rule ix 3, "*visarjanîya* followed by *ksha* is not assimilated," where the examples are *manah ksheme* (v 2 1[7]), *ghanâghanah kshobhanah* (iv 6 4[1]. so all the MSS, both here and under ix 3, my MS of the Sanhitâ reads *kshobhanih*)), and *ukthaçâsah kshâma* (ii.6 12[4]) This is unsound, for then we should have to read *ishe tvâ* (for *ishe tvâ*, i 1 1.et al), by the rule vii 13, "after *vâghâ* and *sha*, *t* becomes *t*," which is wrong Moreover, in the rule (xii.

---

20 *varnottaro hrasvo* [1] *hrasvadîrghaplutânâm âkhyâ bhavati yathâ ivarnapara ekâram* (x 4) *ity âdi varnaçabda uttaro yasmâd asâu varnottarah*

[1] G M. ms. *trayânâm*

4) "*ya, va, na, ha,* when followed by vowels," the final specification would be useless, because already implied in the names given to the letters Hence the opinion referred to is wrong, and the name taught by the rule indicates the consonant alone

As for the actual usage of the treatise, it is somewhat equally divided between the two modes of designation of the consonants, names formed with *a* alone occur nearly sixty times, with *akâra*, nearly eighty times This is exclusive of *r*, which is called *ra* four times, *repha* fifteen times

Compare rule i.39 of the Vâj Pr

ग्रह्णास्य च ॥ २२ ॥

22 As also, of a cited word

The term *grahana* is used in only two other rules of the Prâtiçâkhya (i 24,50), but occurs in the commentary times innumerable, in the sense of 'citation, word taken or extracted from the Sanhitâ to be made the subject of some prescription' (root *grah*, 'seize, take') The commentator, however, gives it an artificial and false etymology, it denotes, he says, either a word respecting which something is to be enjoined (*lakshya*), or one which is the cause (*nimitta*) of an effect produced in some other word The former is called *grahana* because it is "seized" (i e "affected"), the latter, because something is "seized" or "affected" by it It is, he continues, a part of a word, a theme or base The *ca*, 'also,' of the rule brings forward, or indicates the continued implication of, the *a* of the preceding rule The meaning is, then, that *a* forms the name of a citation, a theme, in whatever situation it may occur

---

21 *vyañjanânâm akâra âkhyâ bhavati yathâ takâraç cakâran*[1] *çacachaparah* (v 22) *ity âdi kâraçabdottaratvam idam ca vikalpyate samuccaye tv akâravyaveto vyañjanânâm* (i 17) *iti vyartham syât nanu tarhi kârottaratâ*[2] *kimarthâ*[3] *tadânîm api svarûpenâ*[4] *'kâi alâbhât sa evâ "khyâ bhavatu satyam çikshâdiçâstraprasiddhasamketânusârene*[5] *'ti parihârah apare tu samgirante akârah sarvasvarântasya vyañjanasya grâhaka iti yathâ*[6] *man-.... ghan-.... ukth-.... ity âdi na ksha parah* (ix 3) *iti nishedhasyo 'dâharanam syâd iti tad asâram kutah*[7] *vâghâshapûrvas tash tam* (vii 13) *iti shapûrvatvât*[8] *takârasya tatve krte ish-.... iti syât tac câ 'nishtam. kim ca yavanahasvaraparesh v*[9] (xii 4) *iti atra svaraparaçabdo vyarthah syât bhavanmate sarvasvarântasya*[10] *svîkâraniyamât tasmâd anupapannam eva*[11] *tan matam manmahe kim tu varnamâtrasyâ "khyâ*

[1] W B omit these first two words of the rule [2] G M *-tvam* [3] G M *tham* [4] G M *avyavayaru-* [5] G M *sarâya* [6] W om [7] G M om [8] G M *shatvapû-*. [9] W *yavanahaparasvar-* [10] G M *-ntamatrasya* [11] G M *evâi*

That is to say, if a word be cited in the text of a rule by its theme-ending *a*, all its cases or other derivative forms are to be regarded as equally had in view by the rule Reference is twice made to this principle hereafter by the commentator (under rules vi 13 and x 14), to justify such inclusions The latter of the cases he here brings up, as example of a *nimitta*, or citation of an affecting cause, the cited word is *oshtha*, which is declared to occasion the loss of a preceding *a* or *â* the only two instances of this combination which the Sanhitâ contains are quoted in illustration, viz *svâh" oshthâbhyâm* (vii 3 16[1]), and *upayâmam adharen' oshthena* (v 7 12) As example of a *lakshya*, or citation of a word to be determined by rule, he quotes the end of rule xvi 26, with its illustrative citations, *kiñçilaç caturthah* (v 5 9[2]), and *kiñçilâya cakshayanâya ca* (iv 5 9[1]) This latter example is not very well chosen, as the case is a somewhat difficult and anomalous one (see the note on xvi 26)

This rule, like some of those that follow, is of very small value, since final *a* is not the necessary sign of a cited theme in which other cases are included, and, on the other hand, parts of words not ending in *a* are often cited "for the sake of the inclusion of many words" (*bahûpâdânârtham*)

अःकार आगमविकारिलोपिनाम् ॥ २३ ॥

23 *Ah* makes the name of an increment, or of an element suffering alteration or elision

Here, again, is a precept hardly called for, as the construction and connection of each rule shows in what way any nominative it contains is to be understood, without such an explanation as this, which applies only to a part of the cases, and is unable to teach us which of the three possibilities it contemplates is the actuality in any given case Moreover, it is faultily expressed, and the commentator is obliged to explain that *ah* here stands for the ending of the nominative case, in the dual and plural as well as the singular He quotes in illustration five rules xiv 5 exemplifies a singular increment, vii 1, a singular altered element, v 19, a singular elision, v 25, two-fold altered elements, xxi 12, plural increments

---

22 [1]*lakshyam nimittam ca grahanam ity ucyate. grhyata*[2] *iti grahanam grhyata anene 'ti nimittam api grahanam padâikadeçah prâtipadikam iti yâvat cakârah pûrvasûtroktam akâram âkarshati grahanasya prâtipadikasya sarvâvasthasyâ 'kâra*[1] *âkhyâ bhavati yathâ kiñçilakiñçilâ* (xvi 26) *iti parakiñçilaçabdo lakshyam udâharanam yathâ kiñç- cat-----*[3] *kiñç- caksh----- oshthevahparo lupyate* (x 14) *iti tu*[4] *nimittam · yathâ svâ---- upay----*

(1) W inserts this passage out of place, between rule 19 and its commentary [2] G *grahanyata.* [3] G M omit this example [4] G M om

Rule 28, below, is very intimately connected with this, and the insertion of rules 25–27 between is quite unaccountable.

Rik Pr i 14 includes the second of the three specifications here made, along with rule 28

ग्रहणं वा ॥ २४ ॥

24 Or the simple citation

The commentator says "Of these—namely the increment etc — there is in some cases, alternatively, citation, the meaning is, without any *ah*" And he goes on to quote three rules, in which increment (xvi 29), alteration (vii.3), and elision (v 15) are taught otherwise than as prescribed in the preceding rule—which is not, however, thus amended into acceptableness

आसन्नः संदेहे ॥ २५ ॥ ✕

25 In case of doubt, citation is made of the next

This rule, occurring where it does, appears to have been interpolated by an afterthought, attaching itself to the word *grahanam*, 'citation,' of the preceding rule, without regard to the connection in which that word is used The meaning is, that when the mere citation of a word from the Sanhitâ would leave a doubt as to which occurrence of the word is intended, some part of the context, a word or part of a word, is cited along with it But the commentator's first example and its exposition are quite peculiar He quotes *svayamâtrnnâm ca vikarnîm co 'ttame* (v 3 7[3]), and remarks "There being a doubt, owing to the occurrence of two *ca*'s in this passage, which of them is to be taken to give the *pragraha*-character [to *uttame*], the one next to the proper subject of the rule [*kâryabhâj*, 'the word undergoing the prescribed

---

23 *âgamâdînâm ahkâra âkhyâ bhavati ahkâra iti prathamâ vibhakter upalakshanam âgamasya yathâ* [1]*dvitîyacaturthayos tu vyañjanottarayoh pûrvah* (xiv 5) *vikârino yathâ*[1] *atha nakâro nakâram* (vii.1) *lopino yathâ tishthantyekayâ sapûrvah* (v 19) *ity ekavacanâni laparâu lakâram* (v 25) *iti dvivacanam ânupûrvyân nâsikyâh* (xxi 12) *iti bahuvacanam âgamaç ca vikârî ca lopî câ "gamavikârilopinah teshâm*

(1) B om

24 *teshâm âgamâdînâm kvacid grahanam vâ bhavati ahkârena vinâ 'pî 'ti*[1] *tâtparyam âgamasya yathâ âdirañhatir* (xvi.29) *ity âdi vikarino yathâ hanyâdupyamânam ca* (vii.3) *ity âdi lopino yathâ eshasasya* (v 15) *ity âdi*

1 G M om *iti*

effect?] is to be assumed, in the rule reading *co 'ttame* [iv 11]" He seems to suppose that the "doubt" referred to in the rule concerns the point, which of the two preceding *ca*'s is joined with *uttame* in the precept that establishes the latter's character as a *pragraha* word, and that we need authority for understanding that the latter of the two is taken This is little less than silly His other example is taken from rule iv 15, where *â prshatî* is made *pragraha*, the *â* being the final letter of the preceding word *yuñjâ* (*yuñjâ prshatî*, iv 6 9⁴)

Under a later rule (iv 23) this principle is twice referred to, and very curiously and artificially applied See the note to that rule

अनेकस्यापि ॥ २६ ॥

26 Even of more than one

The genitive in this rule is grammatically inconsistent with the accusative of the one preceding, which I had to translate inaccurately in order to make the connection evident The commentator declares the "even" (*api*) here to continue in force the word *samdehe*, 'in case of doubt,' which is hardly to be approved He interprets "When there is ambiguity, citation is made of more than one word or sound," and quotes *tishthanty ekayâ* (v 19) and *evo 'ttare* (iv 11) as examples But in these we have only one additional word cited, though more than one additional letter, so that both are properly examples under the preceding rule There is no case, I believe, where more than one word requires to be cited along with that at which the rule aims, of a part of a word containing more than one letter we have instances in vi 2,5 etc I see no good reason, however, why these should not be regarded as authorized by the preceding rule, and this one, accordingly, omitted as superfluous

प्रथमो वर्गोत्तरो वर्गाख्या ॥ २७ ॥

27 A first mute, followed by the word "series," is the name of the series

---

25 *samdehe saty*[1] *âsannam* [2]*varnam padam*[2] *vâ grhnîyât svay-.... ity atra cakâradvayasambhavât pragrahanimittatvena katarasyo 'pâdânam kartavyam iti samdehe yad*[3] *âsannam kâryabhâjas tad eva svîkartavyâm co 'ttame* (iv.11) *iti sûtre*[4] *varnasya yathâ â prshatî* (iv 15) *ity âdi*

[1] W om [(2)] G M *padam varnam* [3] G M *yadâ* [4] W B *sarvatra*

26 *samdeha anekasya padasya varnasya vâ grahanam bhavati. apiçabdah samdeha ity anvâdiçati*[1] *yathâ*[2] *tishthanty ekayâ sapûrvah* (v.19) *evo 'ttare* (iv.11) *ity âdi*

[1] G M *âdiçati* [2] W B om

The commentator's example is rule xiv 20, "the *t*-series, followed by the *t*-series," that is to say, a lingual mute followed by a dental. Compare Vaj Pr i 64

अं विकारस्य ॥ २८ ॥

28 *Am* makes the name of a product of alteration.

This is the correlative rule to 23, above, from which it has become strangely separated The commentator explains, as before, that *am* stands here as representative of the accusative case in any number, but the two examples he gives (v 38 and vii 1) are both of them such as the rule might strictly apply to without any such extension of its meaning

पूर्व इति पूर्वः ॥ २९ ॥

29 By preceding is meant preceding

A rule expressed in the form of an identical proposition cannot be claimed to cast much light of itself, but demands a comment as its essential part Our commentator explains "Whatever word is pointed out by the qualification 'preceding,' that word is to be understood as designated by its own form in that situation alone, but not, on account of identity of form, another word standing in a different situation Thus, by the rules (iv 12,13) '*dyâvâprthivî* is *pragraha*, also the preceding word,' the word *yâvatî* is made a *pragraha* in the passage *yâvatî dyâvâprthivî mahitvâ* (iii 2 6^{1}), but it is not therefore *pragraha* in the passage *yâvatî vâi prthivî* (v 2 3^{1})"

पर इत्युत्तरः ॥ ३० ॥

30 By following is meant succeeding

---

27 *vargaçabdottarah prathamah svavargasyâ*[1] *'khyâ bhavati · tavargaç ca tavargaparah* (xiv 20) *iti vargaçabda uttaro yasmâd asâu vargottarah*

[1] W om *sva*

28 *am iti çabdo vikârasyâ 'khyâ bhavati. am iti dvitîyâvibhakter upalakshanam yathâ prathamapûrvo hakâraç caturtham* (v 38) *atha nakâro nakâram* (vii 1)

29 *yah pûrvaçabdena nirdishtah*[1] *sa tatrâi 'va svena rûpeno 'palakshito jñâtavyah na tu rûpasâmânyâd anyo bhinnadeçasthah yathâ*[2] *dyâvâprthivî pûrvaç ca* (iv 12,13) *iti*[3] *pragraho bhavatî*[4] *'ti vakshyati pûrvatvâd yâv-.... iti yâvatîçabdah pragrahah yâv-.... iti tu*[5] *na syât pragrahah.*

[1] G M *viçishyate* [2] W om [3] G M om [4] G M *-vishyati* [5] G M *atra.*

This is the counterpart of the preceding rule, and is explained by the commentator in corresponding terms His illustration is taken from rules iv 49,50, where *dve* and the word following it are declared *pragraha*. In the passage, then, *dve jâye vindate* (vi 6 4[3]), *jâye* is *pragraha*, but not in the passage *yonir asi jâya e 'hi* (i 7 9[1] G M omit *e 'hi*)

The rule is only once referred to hereafter, namely under iv 52, and there for a purpose which it was not intended to answer

ऋकारल्कारौ ह्रस्वौ ॥ ३१ ॥

31 *R* and *l* are short

As examples of short *r* and *l*, the commentator cites *rtavo vâi* (vii.2 6[1]), and *aklptasya klptyâi* (v 4 8[5])

अकारश्च ॥ ३२ ॥

32 Also *a*

"Also" (*ca*), says the commentator, brings forward the implication of "short" from the preceding rule His example of short *a* is *ayam purah* (iv 3 2[1] or 4 3[1])

तेन च समानकालस्वरः ॥ ३३ ॥

33 Also any vowel having the same quantity with the latter

Here again, the "also" continues the implication of the predicate of rule 31, we are told The only vowels contemplated by the rule, further, are *i* and *u*, since there is an absence of the attribute of like quantity with *a* in the diphthongs As examples from the Sanhitâ are quoted *ishe tvâ* (i 1 1 et al), *upaprayanto adhvaram* i 5 5[1] or 7[1] W B omit *adhvaram*), and *atrâ "ha tad urugâyasya* (i.3 6[2] but see the various readings below) The commentator then raises the objection (without introducing it, as usual,

---

30 *yah para ity anena viçishyate so 'pi tatrâi 'va svena rûpena pratyetavyah yathâ dve. paraç ca* (iv 49,50) *iti*[1] *pragraho bhavatî 'ti vakshyati paratvâd dve jâ-.... ity atra jâye iti*[2] *pragrahah* [3]*yo-.... ity atra*[4] *na pragrahah*[3]

[1] G M om [2] G M ins *çabdah* (3) B om [4] G M ins. *tu*

31. *rkâraç ca lkâraç ca hrasvasamjñâu bhavatah yathâ*[1] *rt-....: ak-....*

[1] W B om

32 *akâraç ca hrasvasamjño bhavati cakâro hrasvatvam*[1] *anuâdiçati yathâ: ay-.... iti*

[1] G M -*svam*

with *nanu*), that the matter of the three rules should have been put into this form "*A* is short also any vowel having like quantity with it," because, as actually stated, they are liable to the reproach of saying the same thing over twice (since *r* and *l* are of the same quantity as *a*, and are therefore included in the prescription of the present rule) But he replies that the statement is right in its present shape, for *r* and *l* inhere in *r* and *l*, and one might therefore suppose that, being letters of more than one articulating position, they suffered an extension of quantity, and were not short hence the special rule concerning them The treatise, as was noticed above (under i.2), nowhere describes the formation of *r* and *l*, though it excludes them from the category of simple vowels

The rule of the Vâj Pr (i.55) is nearly the same with this

अनुस्वारश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

34 Also *anusvâra*

The implication being the same as in the preceding rules, *anusvâra* is here defined as having the quantity of a short vowel The commentator explains the occasion for the rule as follows. rule xxi 6, which teaches that *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti* are to be attached to the preceding vowel in syllabication, implies the consonantal character of the former, whence, by rule 37, below, it would have the quantity of a half-mora, and its true quantity of a mora requires special definition

The Vâj Pr (iv 147,148) allows *anusvâra* to make with a preceding vowel, either long or short, two moras, oddly enough distributing the time between the two elements, vowel and nasal, in such a way that the latter has a mora and a half after a short vowel, the vowel being itself shortened to a half-mora, while after a long vowel the nasal is itself cut down to a half-mora, and a mora and a half are assigned to the vowel—a highly artificial ar-

33 *tenâ 'kârena yas tulyakâlah svarah sa ca hrasvo bhavati atrâ*[1] *'pi cakâro hrasvâdeçakah*[2]*: ikâra ukâraç ce*[3] *'ty arthah: samdhyaksharânâm samânakâlatvâbhâvât*[4] *yathâ*[5]*. ish-.... up-.... atr-....*[6] *akâro hrasvas tena ca samânakâlasvara ity ârabdhavyam rkâralkârâu hrasvâv iti tu*[7] *nâ "rabdhavyam: evam ârabhyamâne punaruktatayâ gâuravam bhaved iti ucyate: ârabdhavyam evâ 'yat: kutah. rkâralkârayor antar â*[8] *rephalakârâu stah: tattatsthânatvâd*[9] *anayoh kâlavyabhicârah syât: hrasvatvam na*[10] *gamyeta*[11]*: tan mâ bhûd ity evam ârabhyate. rkâralkârâu*[12] *iti*

[1] G M *tatrâ* [2] G M *hrasvatvâdeçakah samânakâla svara iti* [3] G M om. [4] G M *-kâlasvarâ...* [5] W. om. [6] B *atrâ "ha* only, G M *atra hy*; both as if the introduction to what follows [7] G M om [8] G M *anantare* [9] G M *tatsth-...* [10] ... om. [11] G M *avagamyate.* [12] G M ins *hrasvâu*

rangement The Rik Pr gives no special statement respecting the quantity of the nasal element, but leaves it to be included among the other consonants, which have half a mora of time each

All the "short" elements being now enumerated, the commentator quotes, as example of the employment of the term "short," rule iii 1 As example of *anusvâra*, he quotes *tâñ haste* (vi 1 37)

द्विस्तावान्दीर्घः ॥३५॥

35 An element of twice that quantity is long

The literal meaning of this rule is, says the commentator, that one of the before-mentioned short vowels, when doubled, is long, but its virtual intent is that a vowel having twice the quantity of a short is long I have translated in accordance with the latter interpretation As example of the use of the term "long" is quoted rule x 2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel

त्रिः प्लुतः ॥३६॥

36 An element of three times that quantity is protracted

The commentator explains the virtual meaning of this rule in the same manner as that of the preceding, and quotes in illustra-

34 *bhavaty anusvâraç ca*[1] *hrasvasamjñah yathâ tâñ* .... *cakâro hrasvânvâkarshakah*[2] *anusvârah svarabhaktiç ca* (xxi 6) *iti svarapratyañgatvavidhânâd*[3] *anusvârasya vyañjanatvam tathâ sati hrasvârdhakâlam vyañjanam* (i 37) *ity atrâ*[4] *'rdhamâtratvam*[5] *prâptam*[6] *tan mâ bhûd iti hrasvatvam vidhîyate hrasvasamjñâyâh prayojanam vibhâge hrasvam vyañjanaparah* (iii 1) *iti*

[1] G M *api* [2] G M *hrasvah* [3] MSS *svaram pr*, W *ngavidh-* [4] G M om [5] G M *-tve* [6] G M *-te*

35. *tâvân iti prakrto hrasva ucyate dvir iti dvirûpah*[1] *tâvân hrasvo dîrghasamjño bhavatî*[2] *'ti sûtrayojanâ tâtparyam tu hrasvadvigunakâlah*[3] *svaro dîrghasamjño bhavatî 'ti*[4] *samjñâyâh prayojanam dîrghań samânâkshare savarnapare* (x 2) *ity âdi.*

tion of the term "protracted" rule x 24, which directs that a protracted and a *pragraha* vowel are not liable to combination

All the treatises agree closely in their definitions of vowel quantity, see Ath Pr i 59–62, and the notes upon those rules

ह्रस्वार्धकालं व्यञ्जनम् ॥ ३७ ॥

37 A consonant has half the quantity of a short vowel

This, the comment reminds us, is a rule defining the length of a consonant, not one giving the meaning of the term consonant For, if it were the latter, the word "time" in rule xvii 5, which speaks of "the time of a consonant," would be open to the charge of redundancy We hardly need so trifling and technical a proof of a thing so obvious As example of a consonant, the word *vâk* (e g i.3 9[1] but G M read instead *vâ*) is given us

Of the other treatises, the Ath Pr. (i 60) alone differs from this by giving to a consonant a whole mora as its quantity

उच्चैरुदात्तः ॥ ३८ ॥

38 A syllable uttered in a high tone is acute

The commentator enters into no explanation of the meaning of the definition of the acute tone or accent here given, but simply refers us to a later rule (xxii 9), where the action of the organs in producing the higher tone is more particularly described He adds as example of an acute vowel *sa idhânáh* (iv.4 4[5]. but all the MSS save W read *sá iti*), and quotes rule xiv.29 as exemplifying the use of the term *udâtta*, 'acute' (literally 'elevated'). I have explained in the note to Ath Pr i 14–16 why I prefer, instead of transferring the terms *udâtta*, *anudâtta*, and *svarita*, to translate them by 'acute,' 'grave,' and 'circumflex,' respectively

नीचैरनुदात्तः ॥ ३९ ॥

39 In a low tone, grave

---

37 *vyañjanam hrasvârdhakâlam bhavati na tu vyañjanam iti samjñâ anyathâ*[1] *vyañjanakâlaç ca svarasyâ 'trâ 'dhikah*[2] (xvii 5) *iti* [3] *kâlaçabdasya pâunaruktyâpatteh yathâ vâk hrasvasyâ 'rdho*[4] *hrasvârdhah*[4] [5]*hrasvârdhakâlah*[6] *parimâṇam yasya*[5] *tat tatho 'ktam.*

[1] G M. om. [2] G M omit the last two words of the rule [3] G M ins. *atra.* [4] G M *-dham* [(5)] G. M *hrasvârdham kâlah parimânakâlo yasya*—a good and consistent reading, B is corrupt. [6] W *-lam*

38. *âyâmo dârunyam* (xxii 9) *iti lakshanalakshitah*[1] *svara udâtta ucyate. yathâ sá---- samjñâyâh prayojanam udâttât paro 'nudâttah svaritam* (xiv 29) *iti.*[2]

[1] G M *-ta.* [2] G M. *ity âdi*

We are again referred to the rule in one of the last chapters (xxii.10) which defines the action of the organs in producing the lower tone The example for the accent is *avadatâm* (i 7 2[2] but G M read *avadâtâm*), of which, in *pada*-text, all the syllables are grave, that for the term *anudâtta*, 'grave' (literally, 'not elevated'), is, in W B, rule iv 43, but in G M, rule xiv 29

समाहारः स्वरितः ॥४०॥

40 Their combination is circumflex

The commentator explains *samâhâra*, 'combination,' as from *samâhriyate*, 'it is taken together, collected, combined,' and adds, "the accent arising from the mixing of those two is the circumflex (*svarita*) This is a precept concerning the peculiar nature of the accent, its occurrence is taught further on, in one and another place" and he quotes not less than three of the rules (xiv 29, x 16, and xii 9) which teach under what circumstances the circumflex arises His example of a circumflexed syllable is *tè 'bruvan* (iii 2 2[3] et al)

This rule is so far ambiguous that it does not tell us in what order the acute and grave tones are to be combined to produce the circumflex accent—whether acute and grave, or grave and acute, but we may perhaps assume that the treatise consciously intends them to be taken in the order in which they are defined by the two preceding rules

All the authorities practically agree in their general definition of the three kinds of accent (see note to Ath Pr i 14–16), and Pânini's rules (i 2 29–31) are precisely the same with those here given As regards the details which form the subject of the following rules of our treatise, the accordance is not so perfect (see note to Ath Pr i.17)

तस्यादिरुच्चैस्तरामुदात्तादनन्तरे यावदर्धं ह्रस्वस्य ॥४१॥

41 Of this circumflex, in case it immediately follows an

39 *anv avasargah* (xxii 10) *iti*[1] *sûtralakshitah*[2] *svaro 'nudâtta ucyate*[3]. *yathâ av- samjñâyâh prayojanam anudâtto na nityam* (iv 43) *iti*[4]

[1] W B om [2] G M *-ta.* [3] B *lakshyate* [4] G M give xiv 29, and *ity âdi*

40 *tayor udâttânudâttayor yah samâhârah sa*[1] *svarita ucyate yathâ · tè..... samâhriyata iti samâhârah tayor melanayan*[2] *yasvarah*[2] *svarita*[3] *ity arthah svaritasvarûpavidhir ayam. uparishtât tu* [5]*tatratatra svarito lakshyate*[4] *yathâ · udâttât paro 'nudâttah svaritam* (xiv 29) *udâttayoç ca paro 'nudâttah svaritam* (x 16): *tasminn*[5] *anudâtte*[6] *pûrva udâttah svaritam* (xii 9) *ity âdi*

[1] M om [2] W *-ra*, B *-myah svara* [3] G M om [4] G M *vak-* [(5)] W om [6] W. *tannudâtte.*

acute the first part, to the extent of half a short vowel, is uttered in a yet higher tone

That is, higher than the tone of acute, which properly forms its first element, one is tempted to give the word *udâttât* a double construction, as belonging in idea to *uccâistarâm* as well as to *anantare*

The subject of the more particular definition of the circumflex accent occupies the six following rules, and any comments upon the doctrines laid down will be better reserved until the last rule

As example of the circumflex, the commentator cites the words *sá idhânáh* (iv 4 4[5]), already once given (under rule 38), the first syllable of the second word has the enclitic circumflex, by rule xiv 29, under which the same quotation is repeated

उदात्तसमः शेषः ॥ ४२ ॥

42 The remainder has the same tone with acute

The plain meaning of this rule is distorted by the commentator, in an attempt to avoid a seeming inconsistency He claims, namely, that the word "same with" here signifies "a trifle lower than," "because otherwise there would be no circumflex"—the circumflex having been defined in rule 40 as including both the higher and lower tone But the inconsistency is not evaded by claiming for the last portion of the circumflex any thing short of the actual "grave" tone which rule 40 prescribes if, indeed, giving to its first portion a higher tone than "acute" be not an equal offense against the same rule

सव्यञ्जनो ऽपि ॥ ४३ ॥

43 Along with the consonant, too

Says the commentator—"the rule as formerly given applied to a pure vowel, now the same thing is taught of the circumflexed vowel even in case of its combination with a consonant The circumflexed vowel along with its consonant, either the one which directly follows an acute or another, is as defined The 'too' (*api*) continues the implication of the circumflexed vowel" To this explanation of *api*, as simply equivalent with *ca*, we must demur As any one may see by referring to the various rules in

---

41 *udâttâd anantare yah svarah svaryate tasyâ "dir tâvad uccâistarâm udâttataro bhavati yâvad dhrasvasyâ 'rdham. yathâ sá----*

42 *hrasvârdhakâlâc cheṣka udâttasamo bhavati · 'na tu 'dâtta eva samaçabdaprayogât kimcin nyûnatvam pratîyate'[1]: anyathâ svaritâbhâvât pûrvoktam evo 'dâharanam*

[1] W repeats these clauses in the comment of the preceding rule, after *bhavati*.

which it occurs, it is always best translated by 'even,' as pointing out something which is to a certain degree anomalous, or not to have been naturally expected

As examples of circumflexed syllables containing consonants, the commentary offers *sákhâ sákhibhyo várivah krnotu* (iii 3 11[1] all the MSS except W give only the second and third words, which are the ones to which the rule applies, the second syllable of each has the enclitic *svarita*, and they are to be read and divided *sá-khìb-bhyo vá-rì-vah*), and *tishyàh* (ii 2 10[2] et al but G M omit this example)

I have not observed that any other of the treatises deems it necessary to lay down in terms the principle that the consonant shares in the accentuation of the vowel to which it is attached Though the rule may be regarded as in a manner superfluous, it is less to be objected to in itself than on account of the place where it is thrust in, so wholly out of connection It ought to be somewhere where it can be made to apply to all the three accents, and not to the circumflex alone

अनन्तरो वा नीचैस्तराम् ॥ ४४ ॥

44 Or the part following is uttered in a lower tone

The comment explains *anantara* in this rule as equivalent to *çesha* (in rule 42), and paraphrases by saying that "the remainder of this circumflexed syllable, after the half-mora [of which the character was defined in rule 41], is in a lower tone, that is, is *anudâttatara* ('lower than grave')" Whether this is the true meaning, and not rather that the last part of the syllable, instead of being "of the same tone with acute" (rule 42), is "of lower tone (than acute)," may well be made a question It would be, I should think, an exaggeration of the circumflex of which hardly any theorist would be guilty, to begin it higher than acute, and end it lower than grave The latter of the two interpretations suggested is also (though not unequivocally) supported by the next rule, which may most naturally be regarded as letting down the concluding tone of the syllable one degree farther than the present rule, as this than the preceding

---

43 *kevalasyâ 'yam vidhih purastâd uktah idânîm vyañjanasahitatve 'pi [4]svaritasya tathâtvam ucyate. [1]savyañjano 'pi[1] svarita [2]udâttâd anantaro[2] 'nyo [3]vo 'ktavidhir[3] bhavati apiçabdah[4] [5]svaritam âkarshati[5] yathâ sakhâ---- ti-*

(1) W om (2) W *-ttânant-* (3) W *vâ mukhyâ vi* (4) B om (5) G M *-tâkarshakah*

44. *tasya svaritasya hrasvârdhakâlâc chesho nîcaistarâm anudâttataro[1] bhavati anantarah çesha ity arthah. tad evo 'dâharanam.*

[1] W *dâttaro*

अनुदात्तसमो वा ॥ ४५ ॥

45 Or in the same tone with grave

The commentator does not attempt this time, as under rule 42, to show that "same" means in reality "a little different," but simply paraphrases (taking no account of the *vâ*, 'or') "That same remainder of this circumflexed syllable is the same with *anudâtta*"

आदिरस्योदात्तसमः शेषो ऽनुदात्तसम इत्याचार्याः ॥ ४६ ॥

46 Its beginning is the same with acute, its remainder is the same with grave so say the teachers

Or, it may be, 'so says the teacher,' the plural being used in token of respect the word *âcârya* is not elsewhere found in the treatise (save at xxiv 6) except in the expression *ekeshâm âcâryâ-nâm*, 'of certain teachers,' which occurs several times The commentator does not give us his opinion upon the point, but he declares this to be the only rule that is approved or of force (*ishta*, literally 'desired') in the net-work (*jâla*) of alternative views here adduced, commencing with rule 41 It may, in fact, be looked upon as identical in meaning with the fundamental rule 40, and as presenting the only reasonable and sensible view of the true character belonging to the circumflex accent The elaboration of the theory of the circumflex, the classification of its varieties, and the determination of their relations to one another, appear to have been quite a favorite weakness with the Hindu phonetists The subject occupies the whole of one of the later chapters of this treatise (xx), together with sundry rules in other chapters; and a more detailed examination of it, and criticism of the views taken respecting it, will be necessary in connection with some of those rules

While approving this rule, for the reason that it is in accordance with the last two rules of chapter xx , which define the relation of

45 *tasya*[1] *svaritasya sa eva çesho 'nudâttasamo bhavati*

[1] G M om

46 *tasyâi 'va svaritasyâ "dihrasvârdhakâla udâttasamo bhavati* [1]*çeshas tv anudâttasamo bhavati*[1] *çeshas tv anudâttasama ity âcâryâ bruvate yathâ sakh-.... tasyâ "dir* (i 41) *ity âdyabhyâhite*[2] *'smin vikalpajâle*[3] *sûtram etad eve 'shtam praçlishtaprâtihatayor mrdutarah* (xx 11) *tâirovyañjanapâdavrttayor* (xx 12) *iti lakshanânukûlyât na tû 'paritanam api sûtram ishtam etallakshanaprâtikûlyâd eva*

(1) G M omit, which is better [2] G M *âi abhyâ 'bhihite*, B *âbhyahita* (?—corrupt) [3] W B *-lpya-* (*lppa?*), W *jâte*

four of the kinds of circumflex to one another in respect to hardness of utterance, the commentator rejects in advance the next following rule, as being discordant with them The ground of the asserted accordance and discordance I am not able to discover

सर्वः प्रवण इत्येके ॥४७॥

47 It is all a slide, say some

The commentator says "The word 'slide' (*pravana*) is a synonym of 'circumflex ' the circumflexed vowel, along with its consonants, starting from its beginning, is all of it a slide so some teachers have said" And he adds the same example already more than once given, *sákhibhyo várivah* (iii 3 11[1]) We have seen that, in his exposition of the preceding precept, he has rejected this one, upon grounds of inappreciable value The view here taken is one that might well enough be held by any one, as virtually equivalent with the one before presented the voice somehow makes its descent from the higher to the lower pitch within the compass of the accented syllable, whether by a leap or a slide, is a proper theme for hair-splitting argumentation, but of the smallest practical consequence

नानापदवदिङ्ग्यमसंख्याने ॥४८॥

48 A separable word is treated like separate words, except in an enumeration

The meaning and application of this precept may be best exhibited by means of the examples which the commentator quotes We have a rule (iv 40) that *te* and *the* at the end of a word of more than two syllables are *pragraha* if preceded by *â* or *e* In the passages *oshatât tigmahete* (i 2 14[2]) and *tat pravâte* (vi 4 7[2]), then, the final syllables would be *pragraha*, but that the words in which they occur are separable compounds, written in the *pada*-text *tigma-hete* and *pra-vâte*, and so are exempted by this rule from the

47 *pravanaçabdah*[1] *svaritaparyâyah savyañjana 'eva svarita âdita ârabhya sarvah pravano bhavatî 'ty eka*[2] *âcâryâ ûcire yathâ sakh-*[3] . . . .

[1] B has *pranava* for *pravana* everywhere [2] G M om [3] M *sarvebhyo* .

48 *iṅgyapadam nânâpadavad bhavati asamkhyânavishaye*[1] *nânâpadavad iti kim osh- . . . . tat . . . . ity âdâv âkârâikârapûrvas tu. bahusvarasya te the* (iv 40) *ity atra*[2] *pragrahatvam mâ bhûd iti asamkhyâna iti kim dve paraç ca ekavyaveto 'pi* (iv 49–51) . [3] *dve sav- . . . . ity atra pragrahatvam bhavatv*[4] *iti vadâmah nânâpadam iva nânâpadavat*

[1] G M *-ne vish-* [2] G M om [3] G M. ins. *iti*. [4] G M *prabhavatu*

operation of iv 40 the *te* is in each case the ending of a dissyllabic word. What is meant by "enumeration" is not, in itself, very clear, as the case already cited is, in a certain sense, one of enumeration—namely, of the syllables of a word The commentator shows its intent by pointing out that, by rules iv 49–51, the word *dve*, the next word to it, and the next but one, are made *pragraha* hence, in the passage *dve savane çukravatî* (vi 1 6⁴), *çukravatî* (*pada*-text *çukra-vatî*) must be counted as a single word only, or the *î* of *vatî* would not be *pragraha*

In this, as in the Rik and Atharva Prâtiçâkhyas, the word *iṅgya* (T W B and O more usually write *îṅgya*, or *îṅya*) means a compound word, treated as separable into its constituents in the *pada*-text The St Petersburg lexicon erroneously explains it as signifying a single member of such a compound

Compare Rik Pr i.25, and Vaj Pr i 153

तस्य पूर्वपदमवग्रहः ॥ ४९ ॥

49 Of such a word, the former member is called *avagraha*

The example quoted is *devâyata iti deva-yate* (iii 5 5³)—an instance of *carcâ*, or repetition with *iti* interposed, such as is usual in the *krama*-texts, and, to a certain extent, in the *pada*-texts also The existing *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan would write this word simply *deva-yate*, reserving the repetition with *iti* for words which are *pragraha* and separable at the same time but that of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ treats all separable compounds in the latter method (see, for the varying usages of different texts, the note to Ath Pr iv 74) In *deva-yate*, the part *deva* is denominated *ava-'graha* As instance of the use of this technical term is given the rule (iv 2) which exempts all first members of compounds from the action of the rules prescribing *pragraha*

The commentator, finally, calls attention to the mutual relation, or apposition, of the words *pada* and *avagraha* in the rule, each in its own gender (the former being neuter, the latter masculine) compare under ii 7 and v 2

The other Prâtiçâkhyas use the term *avagraha* in this sense, but without taking the trouble to define it

पदग्रहणेषु पदं गम्येत ॥ ५० ॥

50 In citations of a word, that word is to be understood

That is to say, the cited word itself, and not a part of a word

---

49 ¹*tasye 'ṅgyapadasya pûrvapadam avagraha*¹ *ity ucyate yathâ dev-.... avagrahasaṁjñâyâh*² *prayojanam nâ 'vagrahah* (iv 2) *ity âdi padâvagrahaçabdayor niyataliṅgatvâ-nyonyânvayah*³ *sambhavati*

(1) G M om ² G M om *avagraha* ³ W *niyamal*

identical in form with it Thus (to take the commentator's example), *tve* is later (iv 10) declared *pragraha* except at the end of a separable word, as in the passage *tve kratum* (iii 5 10[1]), the exception specified is necessary, because the *tve* of a word like *adititve* (p *aditi-tve*) is also a *pada* or vocable,—but it is not therefore to be inferred that the *tve* of *kratve*, in the passage *kratve dakshâya* (iii 2 5[2], 3 11[4]), is also *pragraha*

As the commentator had formerly derived *grahanam* (i 22) from *grhyate*, so now he derives *grahanâni* from *grhnanti*, 'they seize, take'

The principle here taught is appealed to several times (under iv 11,38, vii 2) hereafter, in order to the settlement of doubtful points

It would seem possible to be still made a question whether the citation in any particular rule were a *pada*, 'a full word,' or a *padâikadeça*, 'part of a word,' since citations of the latter kind are also frequently made Perhaps the commentator would settle the difficulty by asserting that no combination of articulate sounds which actually occurs in the Sanhitâ as a *pada* is ever cited in any other character

अपि विकृतम् ॥५१॥

51 But that word, even when phonetically altered

The commentator gives two examples The word *vâhana*, he says, is cited later (vii 6) as one whose *n* is liable to conversion into *n* this conversion, then, still holds good, though the final syllable of the word have become *o* thus, *pravâhano vahnih* (i 3 3) Again, *syah*, by v 15, loses its final *visarga*, and it does so, even when its *s* is changed to *sh*, as in *ayam u shya pra devayuh* (iii 5.11[1]) As regards the former of these examples, it might seem to be provided for by rule i 22, above but the commentator would doubtless plead that the rule would apply to *vâhanah*, but not to *vâhano*

---

50 *padagrahaneshu sûtreshu grhîtam padam eva gamyeta* [1] *jñâtavyam na padâikadeçah*[2] *yathâ tve ity aningyântah*[3] (iv 10) *iti vakshyati. tathâ sati tve.... iti pragraho bhavati kra-.... iti padâikadeçân*[4] *na bhavati grhnantî 'ti grahanâni padânâm grahanâni padagrahanâni teshu*

[1] M ins *tad* [2] G M *-çam* [3] W *animny-*, B *aniṅy* [4] G M *-çatvân*

51 *apiçabdah padam anvâdiçati. padagrahaneshu vikrtam api padam avagantavyam yathâ. natvâpattâu vâhana* (vii.6) *iti grahîshyate padam iti krtvâ visarjanîya otvam âpanne 'pi natvam nâi 'va nivartate. pra-....: eshasasyah* (v 15) *iti visarjanîyalopagrahanam pathishyate ay-.... ity atra sakâre shatvam âpanne* [1] *visargalopo bhavaty eva*

[1] G M ins *'pi*

अप्यकारादि ॥५२॥

52 And even when preceded by *a*

The evident occasion of this rule is the frequent occurrence of words with the negative prefix *a* attached to them But, it being once established, its sphere is not restricted to that class of compounds, as is shown in the very example chosen by the commentator to illustrate its working By iii 2, *çvâ* is included among the words whose final *â* is liable to be shortened, then, by this rule, *açvâ* is also included e g *açvâvantaṅ* (p *açva-vantam*) *sahasriṇam* (iii 3 11 [1])

Application of this principle is quite frequently made below (under iii 2,8, v 13,16, vi 5,14, viii 8,13, xi 16, xvi 6,19)

अन्कारादि च ॥५३॥

53 And when preceded by *an*

The origin and aim of this rule are obviously the same with those of the preceding, but the instances of its application are less frequent it is appealed to but three times in the sequel (under rules iii 7, viii 8, and xvi 29) The last case is the one selected by the commentator as his example The word *aṅçu*, by xvi 29, contains *anusvâra*, hence the same word preceded by *an* is to be regarded as included with it, as in the passage *anaṅçu kurvantah* (iii 2 2 [1])

The commentator now raises the question how comes *kâra* to

---

52 *atrâ 'py apiçabdah padânvâdeçakah padagrahaneshv akârâdy*[1] *api*[2] *padam vijñeyam* [3]*çvartâvayunâ* (iii 2) *iti hrasvâdeçe vakshyati akârâder api tasya grahanasya hrasvatvam bhavati yathâ açv-.... akâra âdir yasya tat tathoktam*

[1] G M *diç* [2] G M *ca* [3] G M prefixes the preceding three words of the cited rule

53 *cakârah padam iti bodhayati padagrahaneshv ankârâdy api padam vijñeyam aṅçu* (xvi 29) *ity anusvârâgame vakshyati ankârâder api tasyâ 'nusvârâgamah syât yathâ an-.... ankâra âdir yasya tat tathoktam*

nanv atra sûtre 'n ity asya kârottaratvam katham kriyate varnah kârottarah (i 16) *iti* [1]*sûtre varnasya*[1] *kârottaratvavidhânabhaṅgaprasaṅgât ucyate satyam*[2] *etacchâstrabalân* [3]*na kriyate kim tu çâstrântarabalât*[3] *kriyate yathâ pâninîyâ* [4]*evakâra apikâra*[4] *ityâdînâm sâdhutvam kathayanti evam atrâ 'pi evam ahkâra âgama* (i 23) *ity atra*[5] *codyaparihârâu vijñeyâu*

(1) G M *varnaçabdasya* , [2] G M *tasya* (3) B om (4) G M *evakâre 'pi* [5] G M *atrâ 'pi*

be added here to the syllable *an?* since offense is thus committed against the precept in rule 16, above, that *kâra* is added to an alphabetic sound to form its name His answer is true enough that it is not done by authority of this text-book, but it is done by the authority of other text-books, for example, Pânini's followers establish the propriety of such expressions as *evakâra*, *apikâra* (for the words *eva* and *api*) So likewise in this very treatise (in rule 23, above) we have *ahkâra* for *ah*, and the same objection and answer are to be understood as applying there See the note under rule 16

एकवर्णः पदमपृक्तः ॥५४॥

54 A single sound composing a word is called *aprkta*

The commentator explains *ekavarnah* after the fashion usual with him in treating a *karmadhâraya* or determinative compound "that is both single (*eka*) and a sound (*varna*), hence, a single sound" The term *aprkta* means, he says, 'uncombined with a consonant' As example of an *aprkta* word, he quotes *sa uv ekavinçavartanih* (iv 3 3[2]), where *uv* is, by rule ix 16, representative of the particle *u*, and, as counter-example, to illustrate the force of the specification "composing a word," *yajñapatâsv iti* (vi 6 2[3]), where *v*, though in a manner isolated, is not *aprkta*, being only a fragment of a word Rule ix 16 exemplifies the use of the term

आद्यन्तवच्च ॥५५॥

55 And is treated both as initial and as final

As an instance of the treatment of an *aprkta* word as initial, the commentary again cites the passage *sa uv ekavinçavartanih* (iv 3 3[2]), and declares that in it is to be seen the effect of rule 41, above (G M have here a *lacuna*, and omit the reference to the rule, along with the other instance). This is quite unintelligible to me, since

---

54 *ekaç câ 'sâu varnaç câi* [1] *'kavarnah sa cet padam bhavati so 'prktah*[2] *syât yathâ sa---- padam iti kim yaj---- samjñâyâh prayojanam. ukâro 'prktah prakrtyâ*[3] (ix 16) *iti aprkta iti vyañjanenâ 'samyuta*[4] *ity arthah*

[1] B ins *sa* [2] G M *ktasamjña* [3] G M add the remaining two words of the cited rule [4] G M *yukta*

55 *cakârânvâdishtam tad aprktasamjñam padam âdyantavac*[1] *ca kâryabhâg bhavati âdivad yathâ sa---- ity atra* [2]*tasyâ "dir uccâistarâm* (i 41) *iti kâryam bhavati antavad yathâ o te---- ity atrâ*[2] *'ntah* (iv 3) *iti pragrahakâryam*[3] *bhavati âdiç câ 'ntaç câ "dyantâu tâv ivâ "dyantavat*

[1] G M *âdivad ant-* (2) G M om [3] G M *-ho*

the rule referred to teaches nothing whatever that is characteristic of an initial sound—indeed, teaches no *kâryam*, 'effect,' at all. For the treatment of such a word as a final, we have as an example the passage *o te yanti* (i 4 33), in which *o* is *pragraha*, with reference to rule iv 3, which teaches that only a final vowel is *pragraha*.

With this rule and the preceding compare Vâj Pr i 151–2, which are nearly identical with them in form and meaning. The Rik Pr does not define the term *aprkta*, but gives respecting it a rule corresponding with the present one. Both give in illustration the same passage, *indre " 'hi* (*indra â ihi*), analogous with the one (*bhakshe " 'hi*, iii 2 5[1]) quoted below, under v 3.

वर्णस्य विकारलोपौ ॥५६॥

56. Alteration and omission are of a single sound.

That is to say, not of a whole word. Where, as by v 19, more than one letter is omitted, each is specified. The cited examples are, of alteration, *dhârshâhâu* (i 2 8[2], by rule v 10), of omission, *sa te jânâti* (i 2 14[2 3], by rule v 15).

I find this rule expressly appealed to but once in the sequel (under ix 7).

विनाशो लोपः ॥५७॥

57. Omission is complete loss.

As example of *lopa*, 'omission,' the commentator quotes the passage *sa îm 'andrâ suprayasah* (iv 1 8[1 2]), where the initial *m* of *mandrâ* is lost after *îm* (by rule v 12: see the note there given). As example of the use of the term, he gives rule v 11, which is introductory to the subject of omissions. He then proceeds to state a very curious reason why such a precept as this should seem called for: "some have maintained the eternity of sound: in order to the confutation of that doctrine, this rule hath been uttered, in conformity with general grammar." Pânini's corresponding precept (i 1 60) is *adarçanam lopah*, 'omission is disappearance from view.'

---

56 *varnamâtrasya vikâralopâu syâtâm na tu sarvasya padasya. vikâras tâvat: dhâ- iti. 'lopas tu'[1]: sa ....*

(1) W om. B omits this whole comment, along with the following rule.

57 *varnavinâço*[1] *lopasamjño bhavati. yathâ: sa ..... samjñâyâh prayojanam: atha lopah* (v 11) *ity âdi. varnasya nityatâm kecid âhuh: tannirâkaranâya vyâkaranânusârena sûtram etad abhâni.*

[1] G M *varnasya v.*

अन्वादेशो ऽन्त्यस्य ॥ ५८ ॥

58. Continued implication is of that which was last.

The term *anvâdeça*, 'after-indication,' with its corresponding verbal forms, and other equivalent expressions (especially *anvâkarshaka*, *âkarshaka*, etc.), is constantly employed in the commentary to signify the continued force in a given rule of some specification made in a preceding rule. And the simple meaning of the present precept appears to be, that such a bringing forward is of the predicate last used, the word last cited, or the like. The commentator's first example is entirely accordant with this understanding: in rule vii. 3, namely, to the effect that the *n* of *hanyât* and *upyamânam* is changed to *ṇ*, the implication is "after *niḥ*," *niḥ* being the last mentioned in a list of altering words given in the preceding rule. But he goes on to make another application of the precept: rule xv. 8 says, "*a*, however, even in *saṁhitâ* [is protracted and nasalized]," and it is to be understood that only a "last" or "final" *a* is intended—as in *suçlokâñ3* (i. 8. 16[2]), protracted from *suçloka*; while in *brahmâ3n tvañ râjan* (i. 8. 16[1,2]), *agnâ3 ity âha* (vi. 5. 8[4]), *vicityaḥ somâ3 na vicityâ3 iti* (vii. 1. 9[1]), where the words protracted are *brahman*, *agne*, *somaḥ*, and *vicityaḥ*, and the *a* is not a final, there is no nasalization. Evidently, this is a wholly forced and false interpretation: no rule can mean two things so utterly different. Compare the notes to iv. 3 and xv. 8, where the principle is appealed to.

The comment seeks a kind of support for its double interpretation by calling attention to the distinction between an "affecting cause" (*nimitta*), like the *niḥ* brought forward from vii. 2 to vii. 3 in the first example, and an "affected" word or element (*nimittin*, 'having a cause'), such as is concerned in the second example. The latter (nearly synonymous with *lakshya*, used in the comment to i. 22) he defines as "something original (? *pradhâna* seems to be taken here in the sense of *prakṛti*) suffering a prescribed effect."

No one of the other Prâtiçâkhyas attempts to lay down any rules as to the *anvâdeça* (or *anuvṛtti*), and its usages are, in fact, wholly irreducible to rule—a circumstance which involves the condemnation of the *sûtra* style of composition, because the *sûtras* are not and cannot be self-explanatory, or intelligible without an authoritative comment.

---

58. *nimittasya nimittino vâ 'ntyasyâ 'nvâdeço bhavati: nimittî 'ti pradhânam*[1] *kâryabhâg iti yâvat: nimittasya yathâ: hanyâd upyamânam ca* (vii. 3) *ity asyâ 'tra*[2] *niḥçabdasya: nimittino yathâ: akâras tu saṅhitâyâm api* (xv. 8) *ity atra suçlokâñ3*[3] *ity antyasyâ 'kârasya: antyasye 'ti kim: brah-....: ag-....: vic-....*

[1] W. *-nâm*; G. M. *-na*. [2] G. M. om. [3] B. om. all the signs of protraction.

उपबन्धस्तु देशाय नित्यम् ॥५९॥

59 An *upabandha*, however, is for that particular passage, and of constant effect

The commentator etymologizes *upabandha*, 'connection, tie,' as representing the meaning *upabadhyate*, 'it is tied up, bound to,' and he farther defines it as signifying a passage pointed out by the indication "in that," and one which is designated by an enumeration—referring to rules iv 22,23,48,52 as examples An *upabandha*, then, is a connected part of the Sanhitâ, pointed out and defined by the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya in various ways by citing the first words of a single verse (iv 20) or of an *anuvâka* (iv 25,48, xi 3), by the accepted title of a number of *anuvâkas*, either succeeding one another or otherwise (ii 9,11, iv 52, ix 20, xi 3), by giving the first and last words of a passage (iv 22,23), or by fixing a limit within a certain number of words from a specified word (iv 52) Respecting such a passage, we are told, this rule is intended to teach two things first, that what is prescribed for it does not hold good in other passages—this is signified by the word *tu*, 'however,' in the rule,—second, that an exception which applies in other passages does not apply in it—this is signified by the word *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases'

Both prescriptions, as thus stated, the commentator undertakes to illustrate by quoted cases of their application But his first illustration is imperfectly and obscurely set forth, and is, besides, of a very questionable character He tells us that the passage *ity âha devî hy eshâ devah somah* (vi 1 7[7]) is brought, by the principle laid down in the next rule but one (i 61), under the action of rule iv 25—and this is all that he deigns to say about it The meaning is this the passage quoted contains a series of four words, *ity âha devî hi*, which are also found at ii 6 7[5] (*devî devaputre ity âha devî hy ete devaputre*), and, as the *î* of *devî* in the latter passage is *pragraha* by iv 25, so, under the operation of i 61, it should be *pragraha* also in the other Such, however, is not the case, for *devî* in *devî hy eshâ* is singular, while in *devî hy ete* it is dual It would seem, then, as if we ought to understand the commenta-

---

59 *upabandhas tu svadeçâyâi 'va nityam nirdeçako bhavati ' upabadhyata*[1] *ity upabandhah etasminn ity*[2] *adhikaranarûpah samkhyânavishayaç ca pradeço upabandha ity ucyate. yathâ irâvatî* (iv 22) *ity âdi sûtradvayum somâya svai 'tasmin* (iv 48) *gamayato bhavatah* (iv 52) *iti ca upabandhe yad uktam tad anyatra na bhavatî 'ti tuçabdârthah*[3]. *yathâ*[4] *ity----- atra tripadaprabhrtinyâyena* (i 61) *pûrvajeprabhrty â 'yam* (iv 25) *iti prâptih anyatra yo nishedhah sa upabandhe na bhavatî 'ti nityaçabdârthah yathâ sadohavirdhâne* (iv 11) *iti pragraho grahîshyate kevalahavirdhâna*[5] *iti sarvathâ*[6]

tor to maintain that the present rule annuls the application of i. 61 and, through it, of iv. 25, to the case in question. But this is wholly inadmissible: for rule 61, below, is directly intended as a limitation to the present one, and has no force or value except as it applies to just such passages as the one here instanced; and with the latter are closely analogous a part of the examples adduced for its illustration, and leading to an opposite conclusion to the one here apparently arrived at. I cannot account for the way in which the commentator treats the matter. So far as I can see, *devî* at vi. 1. 7[7] is *pragraha* according to the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya, and has only by some oversight escaped being specially excepted: and the first restriction is of a general character, meaning that directions given for an *upabandha* passage are intended for that passage alone, and have no wider bearing—except as they receive it from i. 61. The same, as will be seen below, limits also the other restriction, that expressed by *nityam*.

Further, the citation in rule iv. 11 of the compound *sadohavirdhâne* as *pragraha* implies that the simple word *havirdhâne* would always be of a contrary character, as it in fact is in the passage *havirdhâne khyâyante* (vi. 2. 11[1]), but this implication does not hold in the passage *havirdhâne prâcî pravartayatam* (iii. 1. 3[1]), because of the inclusion of the latter among the *upabandhas* of rule iv. 52. Here, however, is brought up an objection: the explanation given is not satisfactory, because an exception made elsewhere is sometimes of force also in an *upabandha* passage. For instance, in the passage *atha mithunî bhavataḥ* (vi. 5. 8[6]), the word *mithunî*, which would else be *pragraha* by iv. 52, is made otherwise by iv. 53. Again, an example of a similar class is afforded by *vâyava ârohanavâhâu* (v. 6. 21), where *vâyave* ought to be *pragraha*, because occurring in the *anuvâka* to which iv. 48 refers, while it is deprived of that character by iv. 54. The answer is made, that in the case of *grâmî*, *vâyave*, *manave* and the like, the exception must be allowed to have force because those words are excepted by specific mention; while the exception of *havirdhâne* is inferential only, and therefore does not hold good: specific mention being of more force than mere inference.

---

na pragraho gṛhyate: yathâ[7] *hav-.... ity ayam atra*[8] *nishedhaḥ: hav-.... ity atra na prasarati: gamayato bhavataḥ* (iv. 52) *ity âdinâ prâptiḥ: nanv etad anupapannam: anyatra nishedhasya kvacid upabandhe 'pi darçanât: yathâ: atha.... ity atra gamayato bhavataḥ* (iv. 52) *ity upabandhaprâptir na grâmî* (iv. 53) *ity âdinâ 'nyatra*[9] *nishedhena nishidhyate: tathâ*[10] *vây-.... ity atra somâya sva* (iv. 48) *iti prâptir ate samânapada* (iv. 54) *ity anenâ 'nyatra nishedhena nishidhyate.* * *atro 'cyate: grâmî vâyave manava ity âdînâm kanthoktatvâd esha nishedhaḥ prasaratu*[11] *kevalahavirdhâne*[12] *pragraho*[13] *ne 'ty ârthiko nishedho na prasaraty eva: ârthikakanthoktayoḥ kan-*

But this suggests a further objection why then is not the specific mention of *ate* and *ave* in rule iv 54 enough, and what is the use of adding the word *nityam*, 'in all cases,' in that rule? This, replies the commentator, is for the purpose of making the exception yet more strongly binding the specific mention merely annuls the application of the *upabandha* rule, the addition of *nityam* avoids the application of any other rule For example, in *dve jâye vindate* (vi 6 4[3]), *vindate* should be *pragraha* (by rule iv 51), because separated by only one word from *dve*, and in *vanaspate vîdvañgah* (iv 6 6[5]), the same character would belong to *vanaspate* (by iv 38) because followed by *vîd*—and we are left to infer that the *nityam* renders rule iv 54 capable of reaching these passages, and taking away the *pragraha* character of the two words in question This, adds the commentator, may be still further pursued, it has been thus drawn out in accordance with the view of Mâhisheya

In all this exposition is to be seen something of the artificial and hair-splitting character which is apt to belong to a Hindu comment, while upon the whole it is sound and to the point The term *upabandha* is doubtless better understood actively, as representing *teno 'pabadhyate*, 'that whereby there is binding up' the presence of *deçâya* in the rule is hardly reconcilable with the other interpretation The intent of the specification *nityam* is to exclude general exceptions, made in view of other passages, or of the text at large, but not at all to deny the possibility of exceptions made expressly for the *upabandha* passages and such are iv 53 and others, referred to by the objector, and refuted by an inapplicable special pleading The force which the commentator ascribes to the *tu* of the rule belongs rather to *deçâya*, and the *tu* has the value of a general disjunctive, bringing in a precept not connected with what has gone before

Any additional instances of the application of the principles here laid down I have not searched for or chanced upon The rule is appealed to but once in the sequel (under iv 54)

नानापदीयं च निमित्तं प्रग्रहस्वादिषु ॥ ६० ॥

60 Also a cause belonging to another word, in the case of a *pragraha* or of a word containing *anusvâra*

---

thoktasya prâbalyât nanv ate ave (iv 54) *ity anayoh kanthoktyâ 'vâ 'lam tatra nityagrahanena kim ucyate nitarâm parihârah kanthoktir upabandhaprâptim eva nivartayati nityaçabdas tu prâptyantaram api pariharati. yathâ. dve.... ity atra ekavyaveto 'pi* (iv 51) *iti prâptih van-.... iti* [14] *vîd* (iv.38) *âdiprâptih. evam âdy ûhanîyam*[15] *mâhisheyamatânusârenai 'vam prapañcitam*

[1] B *upanibadhyata* [2] W *itya* [3] G M om *tu* [4] W B om [5] G M *kevalam hav-* [6] G M *sarvadhâ* [7] W om [8] G M *anyatra* [9] G M om [10] G. M *yathâ* [11] G M *rati* [12] B. *kevalam h-* [13] W *-he* [14] G M ins. *atra* [15] G M *-niyamam*

The intent of this rule is made sufficiently clear by the commentator, but he is unable to show satisfactorily its connection, or the implication in virtue of which it comes to mean what it does. He puts, however, a bold face upon it, and declares that the *ca*, 'also,' implies the negative (*nañ*: compare Pāṇini ii 2 6 etc.) meaning signified by *tu* (that is to say, the *tu* of the preceding rule). This is quite unintelligible. More defensible would be the continuance of *nityam*, 'constantly': this, indeed, I conceive to be the real interpretation of the *ca*, although the rule is even thus left insufficiently explained by its context. The term *srâdishu* points us to the sixteenth chapter, where is to be found an enumeration of all the cases in the Sanhitâ exhibiting an *anusvâra* which is not a consequence of the phonetic rules of the treatise—of all the words which in their *pada* form contain an *anusvâra*—and this enumeration is led off (xvi 2) with the syllable *sra*. Many of this class of words are pointed out, as elsewhere in the Prātiçākhya, by mentioning the words which they precede or follow, which latter, then, become in the view of the treatise their *nimitta*, or 'cause' (taking the *post hoc* or *ante hoc* for a *propter hoc*). Inasmuch, now, as the *pragraha* quality and the occurrence of this *anusvâra* belong to the word itself, independently of its surroundings, it becomes necessary to teach that, when a word has been defined by means of its surroundings as thus characterized, it retains its character even when separated from them, as it is in the *pada*-text. Or, in the language of the rule, the defined occasion of a *pragraha* or of a constituent *anusvâra* is of force, even when it is, or is in, another *pada*.

The commentator, in illustration of the action of the rule, refers us first to iv 28, where *ghnî* and *cakre* are declared *pragraha* when immediately followed by *p*; these words are *pragraha* also in the *pada*-text of the same passages, when there is a pause between them and the *p*. Again, he quotes rule xvi 11, where *mâ* is declared to have no *anusvâra* after it when preceded by an *avagraha*, that is, when it begins the second member of a compound, as in *ardhamâse devâh* (ii 5 6[6]): here, too, the precept holds when

---

60. *cakâras tuçabdanigaditam*[1] *nañartham anvâdiçati pragraheshu srâdishu ca nânâpadasambandhi*[2] *nimittam asamhitâyâm api svakâryam*[3] *upadiçatî 'ti pragrahânusvârakâryam*[4] *na nivartate yathâ vakshyati ghnî cakre papare* (iv 28) *pragrahâu bhavata iti: atra pragrahatve papareno*[5] *'padishte padakâle*[6] *tathâi 'va srâdishu ca*[7] *yathâ nâ 'vagrahapûrvah* (xvi 11) *ity avagrahenâ 'nusvârâgame nishiddhe padakâle 'pi tathâi 'va yathâ*[8] *ardh- – – – –. shatvanatvâdâu*[9] *tu nânâpadîyam*[10] *nimittam samhitâyâm eva kâryam karotî 'ty ayam ârambhah: yathâ*[11] *çuc- – – – –. prav- – – – –.*

[1] G M *-bdena ni-*. [2] G M *-dha*. [3] G M *svik*. [4] W *sârak*; B *-hanusvak-*. [5] G M *pakârena*. [6] G M ins. *'pi*. [7] G M om. [8] W om. [9] G M ins. *ca*. [10] G M. *ya*. [11] W om.

the *avagraha* pause intervenes between the two parts of the compound as, *ardha-mâse* On the other hand, the cause (*nimitta*) of alteration of a sibilant or nasal, if in a different *pada* from the letter it affects, is efficient only in *saṁhitâ* for example, *çucishad iti çuci-sat* (iv 2 1[5]), and *pravâhana iti pra-vâhanah* (i 3 3) and this is the occasion of the rule

I see no reason why this rule does not need to apply also to the cases of an original lingual nasal (*n*) enumerated in the thirteenth chapter

यथोक्तं पुनरुक्तं त्रिपदप्रभृति त्रिपदप्रभृति ॥ ६१ ॥

61 A repeated passage, of three or more words, is as already established

That is to say, the reading of any connected passage is as established by the rules for the first place where it occurs if repeated in a later part of the Sanhitâ, where other rules, there applicable, would change its reading, it is exempted from their influence

Several examples are given in illustration by the commentator In the third chapter (*praçna*) of the first book (*kânda*) of the Sanhitâ occurs the phrase *devasya tvâ savituh prasave 'çvinoh* (i 3 1[1] but the same phrase is found also twice before, at i 1 4[2],6), and the initial *a* of its last word is cut off by the general rule xi 1, hence, when it occurs again in a *vâjapeya* passage (namely at i 7 10[3]), where, by xi 3, the elision of the *a* is forbidden, the effect of the latter rule is suspended, and the passage reads as before Again, the words *supathâ râye asmân* are first found at i 1 14[3], where, as the *anuvâka* is a *yâjyâ*, the *a* of *asmân* remains unelided by xi 3, and when they occur again at i 4 43[1], that letter still maintains its place Once more, the phrase *sa jâto garbho asi rodasyoh* is read at iv 1 4[2], and again at v 1 5[3 4], the former time in an *ukhya* passage, where the *a* of *asi* is retained by xi 3, and it is therefore retained in the other passage also

The commentator applies to the rule the restriction that in the repeated passage the word respecting whose form there is question must hold the third place (that is to say, doubtless, that it must have not less than two other words before it) In support of this limitation, he cites a case at iv 2 8[3], in an *ukhya* passage, occur

---

61 *trayânâm padânâm samâhâras tripadam kâryabhâjah padasya trtîyatvam vijñeyam îdrçam tripadam tat[1] prabhrty âdir yasya tat tripadaprabhrti yathoktam pûrvoktam vidhim karoti svaviçeshanam[2] yatra[3] tripadaprabhrti punaruktam cet tathâ [4] lupyate tv akâra ekârâukârapûrvah* (xi 1) *ity anena prathamakândatrtîyapraçne dev-.... ity atrâ 'kâre lupte tad eva vâkyam vâjapeye 'py alopam bâdhitvâ tathâi 'va bhavati. tripadaprabhrtitvât ubhâ vâm* (i 1 14[1]) *ity atra sup-.... ity etad ud u tyam jâtavedasam* (i.4 43[1]) *ity atrâ 'pi tathâi*

the words *prthivîm anu ye antarikshe ye divi tebhyah* (W. B. omit the first two words of the citation), and the *a* of *antarikshe* is left unelided by xi. 3; but at iv. 5. 11[2] (in the last *anuvâka* of the chapter called *rudra*: see rule xi. 3) we read *ye prthivyâm ye 'ntarikshe ye divi* (W. B., again, omit the first two words quoted, and also give *ye ant-*)—which, but for his restriction, would be a violation of the rule. I cannot but question, however, the right of the commentator thus to limit the rule, for I have noted at least three cases where, if it be admitted, the retention of an initial *a* in a repeated passage would be left without authority: they are *pâvako asmabhyam* (v. 4. 4[5] and iv. 6. 1[3,5]), *preddho agne* (v. 4. 7[3] and iv. 6. 5[4]), and *dadhikrâvno akârisham* (vii. 4. 19[4] and i. 5. 11[4]). Whether there are other cases like that to which the commentator appeals, I am unable to say; but I cannot help suspecting that he devised this modification of the rule to suit that particular passage, without sufficient regard to what might be required by other parts of the text.

But he is guilty of another piece of arbitrary interpretation which is still more unjustifiable, and which he makes yet lamer work of defending. The term *tripadaprabhrti* means, according to him, a series of words beginning with three words of which the third is the one whose form is in question—that is to say, a series of at least four words, of which one follows the word of doubtful reading. The case to which he appeals to establish this is as follows: the words *divas pari prathamam jajñe agnir asmat* (W. B. omit *asmat*) occur at i. 3. 14[4], in a *yâjyâ* passage, where *agnih* keeps its initial vowel by xi. 3; again, the words *itah prathamam jajñe agnih* are found at ii. 2. 4[8]: there seems to be a repetition, and a reading of *agnih* founded upon it; but it is not proper to claim that the retention of *a* here has this ground; it is due to the inclusion (in rule xi. 16) of *jajñe* among the words which do not cause the elision: for such inclusion would otherwise be to no purpose (since there is in the Sanhitâ no other passage to which the prescription should apply). Any other case seeming to require the interpretation here in question I have not noticed; and we have the right to presume that, if the commentator had knowledge of one which supported his view more unequivocally, he would not have failed to refer to it. So far as appears, then, the sole object of this forced

---

'va. [5] *sam te vâyur* (iv. 1. 4[1]) *ity atra sa---- ity etat krûram iva* (v. 1. 5[1]) *ity atrâ 'pi tathâi 'va. brâhmanavâkyeshu tu tripadamâtrâd vâ kâryam bhavati. brâhmanavâkyeshu pûrvasthalasyâi*[7] *'vo 'kteh*[8] *yathâ: imâm agrbhnan raçanâm*[9] (iv. 1. 2[1]) *ity atra mar---- ity etad vâkyam*[10] *ut krâma* (v. 1. 3[1]) *ity atrâ 'pi tathâi 'va bhavati. kâryabhâjah padasya trtîyatvam iti kim? prth---- ity*[11] *ukhye. ye---- iti rudrottamânuvâke prabhrtî 'ti kim? tvam agne rudrah* (i. 3. 14[1]) *iti yâjyâyâm divas--- iti vâkyam. agnaye 'nnavate* (ii. 2. 4[1]) *ity atra*

interpretation of the word *tripadaprabhṛti* (one which the word may be said decidedly not to admit of) is to save rule xi 16 from the charge of repetition in a single point we shall presume with much greater plausibility that, when the rule was made, the fact that this particular case was already covered by i 61 was over-verlooked

But the commentator virtually admits the unsoundness of his own work by acknowledging that in the *brâhmana*-passages (*brâhmanavâkya*) of the Sanhitâ a simple phrase of three words is enough to justify the application of the rule, "because," he says, "of the quotation in the *brâhmana*-passages of a previously-occurring phrase" that is to say, because the prose part of the Sanhitâ is to so great an extent occupied with citing and commenting on the phrases and words of other parts—a fact which has, doubtless, been the special occasion and suggestion of the present rule Thus, the words *maryaçrî spṛhayad varno agnih* are quoted at v 1 3[3] (with the customary addition, *ity âha*), from the previous passage iv 1 2[5] and although the *nâbhim* which follows *agnih* at its first occurrence is not also quoted, and the quotation is not therefore a *tripadaprabhṛti* according to the commentator's construction of this term, the rule holds good, and the *a* of *agnih* has a right to stand

The general value of this rule is that of a limitation to the last but one, it points out a class of cases in which a rule given for a particular passage is not limited to that passage, but also acts elsewhere, in which, moreover, such a rule does not govern *nityam*, 'against all opposition,' the reading of the passage to which it relates

The commentator notices the fact that the repetition of the final word of the rule indicates the conclusion of the chapter Such repetition is made at the end of each chapter, and by all the manuscripts, and, as it is thus farther ratified by the comment, I have not hesitated to admit it as an authentic part of the text of the Prâtiçâkhya G M repeat the whole rule in this case

---

itah ---- *iti punaruktam tat*[12] *tathâi 'vâ 'bhavad*[13] *iti cet mâi 'vam tripadamâtrâd*[14] *eva tathâbhâva*[15] *iti* [16] *vaktum na yuktam kim tu jajñe sañsphânah* (xi 16) *iti jajñegrahanasâmarthyât* · [17]*anyathâ tasya*[18] *vâiyarthyât*[17] ।

padavîpsâ[19] *'dhyâyaparisamâptim dyotayati*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
prathamo 'dhyâyah

[1] G M om [2] W *nâya*, G M *shena* [3] G M *idam* [4] G M ins *hi* [5] G M. ins *tathâ* [6] G M om [7] G M *purvasyai* [8] G M *'ktah* [9] G M om [10] G M om [11] G M ins *ebhya* [12] G M om [13] G M *syâd* [14] G M *tripadâd*. [15] G M *tathâ bhavatu* [16] G M ins *atra* (17) W om [18] G M *tasyâi 'va*. [19] G M *padâvṛttyâ*

CHAPTER II

CONTENTS 1–11, general mode of production of articulate sounds, distinction of surd and sonant sounds, etc , 12–29, special rules for the production of vowels and diphthongs, 30, nasals, 31–34, difference of vowels and consonants, 35–39, mode of production of mutes, 40–43, of semivowels, 44–45, of spirants, 46–48, of *h* and *ḥ*, 49–52, of nasal sounds

अथ शब्दोत्पत्तिः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the origin of sound

For the word *atha* in this rule the commentator allows us our choice between two interpretations it either indicates immediate succession—thus, the list of articulate sounds having been given, there next arises the desire to know what is the cause of these sounds, or how they become apprehensible by the sense, and then follows the explanation here to be given—or it is introductory, signifying that from this point onward the subject of the origin of sound is the one had in hand Compare the similar and yet more lengthy discussion under rule i 1 He then goes on to draw out the significance of the rule itself *Çabda* he explains by *dhvani* both, when used thus distinctively, mean audible sound in general, rather than articulate sound or voice (compare xxii 1,2, xxiii 3) He paraphrases "of the articulate sounds, *a* etc , the cause of perception, or their origin, their birth, the apprehension by the sense—just as, even before water is seen, there is moisture in the ground, and that becomes visible in consequence of digging—this is the subject of description" We seem to catch here a glimpse of that same doctrine of the eternity of sound to which reference was made above, under i 57 our organs do not properly produce it, but their action brings it to the cognizance of the senses, as the action of digging brings water to light

---

1 *ukto varnasamâmnâyah teshâm varnânâm kîdrk*[1] *kâranam*[2] *katham vâ tadupalabdhir ity âkâñkshânantaram*[3] *nirûpyata ity ânantaryârtho 'thaçabdah atha vâ ita uttaram yad vakshyate tac chabdotpattir ity etad*[4] *adhikrtam veditavyam ity adhikârârthah çabdo nâma dhvanih varnânâm akârâdînâm upâdânakâranam*[5] *tadutpattir*[6] *janma upalabdhir vâ yatho 'dakasya* [7]*darçanât pûrvam eva bhûmâu jalam asty eva tat khananâd*[8] *drçyate tadvat*[7] *se 'yam ucyata*[9] *iti sûtrârthah*

[1] G M *kidrçam* [2] W *karanam* [3] G M ins *tan* [4] G M om [5] B *-karanam* [6] G M *tasya ut* (7) W B om [8] MSS *khananâ* [9] G M *ârabhyata*

वायुशरीरसमीरणात्कण्ठोरसोः संधाने ॥ २ ॥

2 By the setting in motion of air by the body, at the junction of throat and breast.

The first part of this rule (literally, 'from air-body-impulsion') is obscurely expressed, and of ambiguous meaning. The commentator gives three explanations of it, the first of which is also itself obscure. Agni ('fire, warmth'—'heat of the body'?), he says, impels Vayu ('air, wind'), that is what "air-body" means (but how?). From such an impulsion—that is to say, expulsion, effort at utterance—at the junction of, or between, throat and breast, comes the origination of sound. And he quotes a verse from the Çikshâ (verses 8–9 of the Yajus version, verses 6–7 of the Rik version; see Weber's Ind. Stud., iv 350–1): "the mind impels the body-fire; that sets in motion air; and air, moving in the breast, generates a gentle tone." Again (or rather, apparently, as a part of the same explanation; but its inconsistency with the rest is palpable), he makes a copulative compound of *vâyu-çarîra*, namely 'air-and-body:' "from the impulsion of those two." Once more, he quotes as the opinion of other authorities that *vâyu-çarîra* means 'the air in the body,' the compound being of such a sort that that which should be its first member is put last, after the analogy of *râjadanta*, 'upper incisor' (literally, 'king-tooth'—that is, as the Hindu etymologists explain it, 'tooth-king, chief among the teeth'), and the other words composing that *gaṇa* (to Pân. ii 2 31). And he adds the remark that, in this interpretation, the air is understood as the cause of the impulsion, not its product.

In the translation of the rule given above, the primary division of the compound is regarded as to be made after *vâyu*, *çarîra-samîraṇa* meaning an 'impulsion by the body,' and *vâyu* being prefixed in a genitive relation, 'of the air.' This is harsh, but appears to me more acceptable and less violent than the other constructions proposed. Practically, the point is of small consequence.

---

2 *vâyum agnih samîrayatî 'ti vâyuçarîram: tathâbhûtât samîraṇât preraṇâd abhighâtâd*[1] *ity arthah. kaṇṭhorasoh saṁdhâne madhyadeçe çabdotpattir bhavatî 'ti*[2] *çikshâ câi 'vam astî 'ti*[3]

manah kâyâgnim[4] *âhanti*[5] *sa*[6] *prerayati mârutam*[7]
mârutas tû 'rasi caran mandram janayati [8]*svaram*

iti[8] *vâyuç ca çarîram ca vâyuçarîre: tayoh samîraṇam: tasmât*[9] *anye tv âhuh: vâyoh çarîre satah samîraṇam:* [10]*tasmâc chabdotpattir iti. tatre*[11] *'ttham samâsah: râjadantâditvâc charîrasya*[12] *paranipâtah: çarîre vâyur*[13] *vâyuçarîram: tasya samîraṇam*[10] *tasmât. asmin mate vâyoh samîraṇakartṛtvam eva na tu karmatvam.*

[1] G M *abhipa-*. [2] G M om. [3] G M om. [4] G M *gni*. [5] G M *kanti*. [6] G M *sam*. [7] G M om. (8) G M om. [9] G M ins *vâyuçarîrasamîraṇât*. (10) B om. [11] G M *atre*. [12] G M *raçabdasya*. [13] G M om.

Compare with what is taught by our treatise here and later (xxii 1,2, xxiii 1–3) Vāj Pr i 6–9, Rik Pr xiii 1

तस्य प्रातिश्रुत्कानि भवन्त्युरः कण्ठः शिरो मुखं नासिके इति ॥ ३ ॥

3 The parts which give it audible quality are breast, throat, head, mouth, and nostrils

The commentator explains *prâtiçrutkâni* as signifying 'the places of production (*sthânâni*), having to do with the resonance (*pratiçrut*=*pratidhvani*, 'resonance'), of the aforesaid sound (*çabda*)' He offers no remark upon the organs enumerated, but leaves their various offices to be derived from the rules which follow But, in anticipation of the next three rules, he observes that they teach the three-fold quality of sound, as sonant, surd, and *h*-sound, rule 4 giving the definition of the first kind

The Çiksha (v 13 Weber's Ind Stud iv 351) makes an enumeration of eight *sthânas*, or places of production of articulate sounds, dividing the "mouth" of our list into root of the tongue, teeth, lips, and palate

संवृते कण्ठे नादः क्रियते ॥ ४ ॥

4 When the throat is closed, tone is produced

The commentator treats this rule as a definition of the technical term *nâda*, 'tone,' and cites rule 8, below, as an example of the use of the term

The Rik Pr (xiii 1) gives a corresponding definition of sonant utterance, but specifies the aperture (*kha*) of the throat as the part whose contraction or closure produces the tone Compare also Vāj Pr i 11 It is greatly to the credit of the ancient Hindu phonetists that they had gained by acute observation so clear an idea of the manner in which the intonation of the breath is effected in the throat, but precisely how accurate a knowledge

---

3 *tasya prakrtasya*[1] *çabdasyo 'rahprabhrtîni sthânâni* [2] *bhavanti pratiçrut*[3] *pratidhvanih* [4]*tatsambandhîni prâtiçrutkâni*[4] [5]*samvrte kanthe nâdah kriyate* (ii 4) *etadâdinâ sûtratrayena çabdatrâividhyam*[6] *ucyate nâdah*[7] *çvâso hakâraç ce 'ti tâvan nâdalakshanam âha*[8]

[1] G M *prakrti* [2] G M ins *pratiçrutkam* [3] G M *çrutka* (4) W om (5) G M insert this (excepting the rule) at the beginning of the commentary to the next rule [6] G M *çabdasya tr* [7] MSS *nada* [8] G M *ucyate*

4 *samvrte kanthe yah çabdah kriyate sa nâdasamjño bhavati samjñâyâh*[1] *prayojanam nâdo 'nupradânam* (ii 8) *iti*[2]

[1] G M *nâdasam-* [2] G M *ity adi*

they had of the nature and action of the vocal chords, whose tension produces the closure, we, of course, cannot say

विवृते श्वासः ॥५॥

5 When it is opened, breath is produced

The explanation given of this rule corresponds with that of the preceding, and the rule cited for the use of the term *çvâsa*, 'breath,' is ii 10

मध्ये हकारः ॥६॥

6 When in an intermediate condition, the *h*-sound is produced

Madhye is explained as meaning 'in a method intermediate between closed and opened' the rest of the comment agrees with the two preceding, and the cited rule is ii 9

Of the other Prâtiçâkhyas, only that of the Rig-Veda sets up a third kind of articulated material, besides tone and breath, and that (xiii 2) derives the material from a combination of the two others, rather than their mean I have already (note to Ath Pr i 13) expressed my opinion that the attempt to establish this distinction is forced and futile, and I see at present no reason for changing it That intonated and unintonated breath should be emitted from the same throat at once is physically impossible In loud stridulous whispering, there is a tension of the vocal chords only short of that which gives rise to sonant vibration, and if any one chooses to claim that the aspirations used in loud speaking partake of such a character, sometimes or always, we need not be at the pains to contradict him

ता वर्णप्रकृतयः ॥७॥

7 Those are the materials of alphabetic sounds

That is to say, the three kinds of material just described—tone, breath, and *h*-sound, some letters having one of these as the material out of which they are made, and others another Just so, it is added, jars and dishes have clay for their material, and thread is the material of cloth

The commentator then goes on to raise and answer a grammatical objection to the form of the rule Since it is the office of a

---

5 *vivrte kanthe yah çabdah kriyate sa çvâsasamjño bhavati samjñâyâh prayojanam* ***aghosheshu çvâsah*** (ii 10) *iti.*

6 *samvrtavivrtayor madhye madhyaprakâre yah çabdah kriyate sa hakârasamjño bhavati samjñâyâh prayojanam* ***hakâro hacaturtheshv*** (ii 9) *iti*

pronoun to call to mind things already mentioned, and the words *nâda*, *çvâsa*, and *hakâra*, which are referred to by the pronoun in this rule, are masculine, why is the pronoun feminine (*tâh*, instead of *te*)? The reply is "by the *dictum* of the Mahâbhâshya, 'pronouns effecting the equivalence of the thing pointed at and of that which is pointed out respecting it assume at pleasure the gender of either of the two,' is established the propriety of the form used in the rule, therefore there takes place a mutual accordance, or apposition" The passage referred to is apparently that found, not in the Mahâbhâshya itself, but in Kaiyyata's Mahâbhâshya-pradîpa, nearly at the beginning of the work (I owe this reference to the kindness of Prof Goldstucker) in Ballantyne's edition (p 7) it reads, with several variations from the text given by our commentator, *uddiçyamânapratinirdiçyamânayor ekatvam âpâdayanti sarvanâmâni paryâyena tallingam upâdadata iti* Reference is again made to this passage for a similar purpose under v 2

The Rik Pr (xiii 2) has this rule also, in nearly identical form

नादो ऽनुप्रदानꣳ स्वरघोषवत्सु ॥ ८ ॥

8 In vowels and sonant consonants, the emission is sound

The term *anupradâna* is etymologized as representing *anupradîyate 'nena varnah*, 'therewith is given forth an articulate sound,' and *anupradîyate* is farther explained by *upâdîyate*, 'is obtained,' and *janyate*, 'is generated' As synonym for the same term is given *mûlakârana*, 'radical cause'

I have already (note to Ath Pr i 13) called attention to the praiseworthy unanimity with which the Hindu phonetists define

---

7 *varnânâm prakrtayo varnaprakrtayah tâ varnaprakrtayo bhavanti ye nâdaçvâsahakârâ uktâh nâdaprakrtayah kecid varnâh çvâsaprakrtayo 'nye hakâraprakrtayo 'nye yathâ mrtprakrtayo ghataçarâvâdayah yathâ vâ*[1] *tantuprakrtayah patâh nanu sarvanâmnah prakrtaparâmarçitvân*[2] *nâdaçvâsahakâreshu pumlingeshu*[3] *satsu tâ iti strîlingaprayogah katham sâdhuh ucyate uddiçyamânapratinirdiçyamânayor*[4] *ekatâm âpâdayanti sarvanâmâni kâmacârena tallingam*[5] *upâdadata iti mahâbhâshyavacanât prayogasâdhutvam adhyavasîyate tasmâd anyonyânvayah*[6] *sambhavati*[7]

[1] G M om [2] G M *rçakatv* [3] G M ins *paramaiçarheshu* [4] W *-prakrtinird-* [5] W *-ngatam*, G M *tattall* [6] G M *yasambhavah* [7] G M om

8 *svareshu ghoshavatsu ca*[1] *varneshu nâdo 'nupradânam bhavati. anupradîyate 'nena varna*[2] *ity anupradânam mûlakâranam anupradîyata upâdîyate janyata ity arthah*

[1] W om [2] W B *-nâ*

the true ground of the distinction between surd and sonant letters European phonetists, after long perplexing the subject with such false distinctions as are expressed by the terms "soft" and "hard," "weak" and "strong," and the like, seem now at last to be coming to a universal accordance in the correct view.

हकारो हचतुर्थेषु ॥ ९ ॥

9. In *h* and in sonant aspirate mutes, it is *h*-sound.

For the quality of this *h*-sound, see rule 6, above. The Rik Pr. (xiii. 2, 5: rules 6, 17) connects in the same manner *h* and the "fourth" mutes. Our treatise evidently regards the peculiar *h*-sound belonging to the sonant aspirates not as something that follows the breach of contact, but as inhering in the letter, in the same manner as tone in the simple sonants. Whether the Rik Pr. hints at a difference of opinion on this point may be made a matter of question. But the failure on the part of the Prâtiçâkhyas to recognize the essentially compound character of the aspirate mutes, the fact that these differ from the unaspirated mutes by interposing something between the mute and the following vowel, is one of their marked weaknesses.

The commentator enters into no labored exposition of the rule, but spends his strength, rather, in defending its situation. He first suggests the objection that it is not in proper place, as offending against the order observed in the definition of the three kinds of material (the *h*-sound is defined last, and we should therefore expect the letters containing it to be specified last), but claims in reply that it is, after all, in place, being intended to obviate an undue extension of the preceding rule, which would otherwise be liable to be made, since *h* and the "fourth" mutes are included (by i. 13, 14) among the sonant consonants, to which that rule applies.

अघोषेषु श्वासः ॥ १० ॥

10. In surd consonants, it is breath.

Which are the surd consonants, was taught us in rule i. 12.

---

9. *hakâraç*[1] *ca caturthâç ca hacaturthâḥ: teshu varṇeshu*[2] *hakâro 'nupradânam bhavati. nanu saṁjñâvidhânakramabhañgaprasañgân*[3] *nâ 'tre 'dam sûtram avatarati. ghoshavatsv iti sâmânyân nâdo hacaturtheshu ca*[4] *prasajyata*[5] *ity atiprasañgaparihârârthatvâd avataraty eve 'ti vadâmaḥ*[6].

[1] W. *haç.* [2] W. om. [3] G. M. B. *bhañgân.* [4] G. M. om. [5] G. M. *-jyeta.* [6] G. M. *vâdaḥ.*

10. *aghosheshu varṇeshu çvâso 'nupradânam bhavati*[1].

[1] B. omits rule and comment.

भूयान्प्रथमेभ्यो ऽन्येषु ॥ ११ ॥

11 And more of it in the other surd letters than in the simple surd mutes

Here *çvâsa*, 'breath,' is continued by implication from the preceding rule "in virtue of vicinage" (*sâmnidhyât*), as the commentator says (there being no *ca*, 'and,' in the rule, to indicate it directly) The other surd letters are the surd aspirate mutes and the spirants (excepting *h*) There is no separation made of these two classes upon the important ground that in the spirants the greater expenditure of breath inheres in the whole character of the sound, as being fricative, while in the aspirate mutes it consists in a brief emission between the explosion of the contact and the following vowel

The Rik Pr (xiii 6 rule 19) says "some regard the breath in the aspirates as quicker"—an ambiguously indefinite expression

अवर्णे नात्युपसंहृतमोष्ठहनु नातिव्यस्तम् ॥ १२ ॥

12 In forming the *a*-vowels, the lips and jaws must not be too nearly approximated, nor too widely separated

The plain intent of this rule appears to be to guard against an excess either of openness or of closeness in the utterance of *a* and *â*, while at the same time these two sounds are considered as alike in quality Such is not, however, the understanding of the commentator, he declares it impossible to follow both directions in forming one sound, and directs that a division be made excessive approximation is to be avoided in the case of *a*, and excessive separation in those of the long *â* and protracted *âs* If his intention had been to recognize the same difference in quality between *a* and *â* which is taught by the Ath Pr and Vâj Pr and by Pânini (see note to Ath Pr i 36), he would have been likely to apply the two directions of the rule in a contrary manner, warning against over-openness in *a* and over-closeness in *â*

---

11 *sâmnidhyâc chvâsa iti labhyate prathamebhyo 'nyeshv aghosheshu çvâso*[1] *bhûyân adhiko bhavati*

[1] G M om

12 *avarna uccâryamâna oshthahanv atyupasamhrtam atisamçlishtam na bhavati ativyastam ativivrtam* [1]*ca na*[1] *bhavati oshthâu ca hanû c' oshthahanu dvandvaç ca prânitûryasenâñgânâm* (Pân ii 4 2) *ity ekavadbhâvah tad etad*[2] *ekasminn ubhayathâ na çakyate kartum iti yogavibhâgah kâryah*[3] *akâre nâ*[4] *'tyupasamhrtam âkâre ca*[5] *plute ca nâ 'tivyastam iti*

(1) W *na ca* [2] W *eva tad*, G M om [3] G M B om [4] W G *nâ* [5] W B om

The term *oshthahanu*, though singular, is declared to signify the two lips and the two jaws, and a rule of Pânini (ii.4 2) is quoted in justification of such treatment of a copulative compound

ओकारे च ॥ १३ ॥

13 Also in uttering *o*

The "also" (*ca*) of this rule, we are told, brings forward only the action of the jaws prescribed in the preceding rule this appears from the fact that the one following gives a special direction with regard to the action of the lips In forming an *o*, then, the jaws are not to be too widely separated

ओष्ठौ तूपसंहृततरौ ॥ १४ ॥

14 But the lips are more nearly approximated

"Vicinage" is here again made the sufficiently obvious ground of assuming that the direction applies to the utterance of *o* The "but" (*tu*) of the rule, according to Vararuci, one of the three authorities from whom our comment is principally derived (see the introduction), annuls the direction formerly (in rule 12) given as to the position of the lips but Mâhisheya, another of the same authorities, has explained it as exempting from the widely separated condition the *o* of such words as *bandhoh* (ii 5 8[7]) This latter interpretation is quite absurd, or else I am very obtuse with regard to it.

As regards the precise tone of the *o*, such directions as these can teach us nothing satisfactory The only valuable conclusion which we derive from them is that the authors of the Prâtiçâkhya looked upon the sound as a simple homogeneous tone—not phonetically diphthongal, although in classification excluded (by rule i 2) from the category of simple vowels The same, we shall see, is the case with *e* also

ईषत्प्रकृष्टावेकारे ॥ १५ ॥

15 In uttering *e*, they are slightly protracted

---

13 *cakâro hanumâtrakâryânvâdeçakah oshthakâryasya parasûtrena viçeshavidhânât okâra uccâryamâne hanû ativyaste na bhavatah*

14 *sâmnidhyâd okâra iti labhyate okâre kârya oshthâv*[1] *upasamhrtatarâu syâtâm tuçabda oshthayoh pûrvoktavidhim nivârayatî*[2] *'ti vararucir uvâca. mâhisheyas tu babhâshe. bandhor ity âdikam okâram savyañjanam*[3] *vyastuto*[4] *nivârayatî 'ti.*

[1] W B om [2] G M *vâr-* [3] G M *vyañj* [4] W *vyes-*

That "they" means the lips is, we are told, sufficiently indicated by the dual number of the adjective *Prakrshta*, 'protracted,' is glossed by *samnikrshta*, 'drawn down together, brought near'

उपसंहृततरे हनू ॥ १६ ॥

16 The jaws are more nearly approached

The force of the comparative is explained by the usual term *atiçayena*, 'with excess'

In the utterance of *e*, the position of the tongue is also a matter of importance, and is explained in the next rule

जिह्वामध्यान्ताभ्यां चोत्तराञ्जम्भ्यान्त्स्पर्शयति ॥ १७ ॥

17 And one touches the borders of the upper back jaws with the edges of the middle of the tongue

The "and" (*ca*) in this rule we are directed to regard as bringing forward the *ekâra* of rule 15, "on the frog-leap principle"—that is to say, by overleaping the intervening rule The terms descriptive of the organs concerned I have translated in accordance with the directions of the commentator, although much tempted to render *jambhyân* by 'jaw-teeth, grinders' I cannot doubt that *jambhyân* is the true reading here, although the MSS give a curious and perplexing variety of forms to the word, and *uttarâñ jambhyânt* is not once read T comes nearest to it, giving *uttarân jambhyâm*, W has *uttarâ jambhyâmt* in the rule, and *uttarâ jabhyân* and *jabhyân* in the comment, B, *uttarâñ jabhyât* in the rule, *uttarâ jabhyân* and *jambhyân* in the comment, G and M, *uttarâñ jabhyâm* in the rule, G, *uttarâm jabhyâm* and *jambhyâm*, and M, *uttarâñ jabhyâm* and *jabhyâm*, in the comment The verb *sparçayati* is equivalent to *sprçet*, the causative ending *nic* being added without altering the meaning of the simple verb (compare Pân iii 1 25), as in *pâlay* for *pâ*, and other like cases

---

15 *prakrshtâv ity atra dvivacanena prakrtâv oshthâu grhyete ekâre kârya oshthâv îshatprakrshtâu syâtâm prakrshtatâ samnikrshtatâ*

16 *sâmnidhyâd ekâra iti labhyate ekâre kârye hanû upasamhrtatare bhavatah atiçayeno 'pasamhrte upasamhrtatare*

17 *ekâre kârye jihvâmadhyântâbhyâm uttarâñ jambhyânt sparçayati sprçed ity arthah pâlayatî[1] 'ty âdivat svârthe nic jambhyân iti hanûmûlaprântadeçân[2] ity arthah mandûkaplutinyâyena[3] cakâra ekâram âkarshati jihvâyâ [4]madhyam jihvâmadhyam tasyâ 'ntâu[4] tâbhyâm jihvâmadhyântâbhyâm*

[1] G M *palây-* [2] G M *-çam*, W *ntaprade-* [3] G M *-kagalmy-* (4) W *madhya antâu*, B *madhyasya anan*

In order to complete the definition of the mode of production of *e*, rules 20 and 23, below, have yet to be applied, but they add nothing essential to the description of the present rule, which assures to the vowel, as clearly as any such description could do, the "continental" sound of *e*, or that which it has in *they*, short in *met* There is no hint of a composite or diphthongal utterance, any more than in the case of *o* A diphthongal utterance, however, as *ai*, *au* (in *aisle*, *house*), we must assume them to have had originally (compare note to Ath Pr i 40)

उपसंहृततरे च जिह्वाग्रमृकारर्कारल्कारेषु बर्स्वे-
ष्वुपसंहरति ॥ १८ ॥

18 The jaws, also, are more closely approximated, and the tip of the tongue is brought into close proximity to the upper back gums, in *r*, *r̂*, and *l*

The construction of this rule is very harsh the subject *hanû*, 'jaws,' comes into its first member again with a flying leap from rule 16, drawn by the *ca*, 'also,' while the second member starts off independently, "one approximates," with no connective to bind it to the other These roughnesses are unremarked by the commentator, and I have smoothed them over in the translation The word *upasamharati*, 'approximates,' is glossed in the comment by *nikshipet*, 'let one throw down (or apply),' and *barsvâs* is explained as 'the high places behind the row of teeth'—that is, the swelling of the inner gums

The commentator starts a question as to the propriety of the conversion of *r̂* and *l* in this rule into *r* and *l* after *a* (*rkârarkâralkâra*, from *rkâra rkâra-lkâra*), the cases not being covered by the prescription given below (at x 8 no case of the combination of *r̂* and *l* occurring in the Sanhitâ, the Prâtiçâkhya makes no provision for it) he is compelled to acknowledge that this treatise does not teach the conversion, but claims that it is justified by the authority of other text-books, and that the same explanation applies to an earlier case (rule i 31) of a like combination

This wholly insufficient direction is all that our treatise gives

---

18 *caçabdo hanvor*[1] *anvâdeçakah rkâra rkâra lkâre ca kârye hanû*[2] *upasamhrtatare bhavatah jihvâgram ca barsveshû 'pasamharati nikshipet barsveshv iti dantapañkter uparishtâd uccapradeçeshv ity arthah nanv aram rkârapare* (x 8) *iti lakshanâsambhavâd*[3] *rkârarkâralkâreshv iti katham samdhih sâdhuh. satyam nâi 'tallakshanât kim tu çâstrântarabalât*[4] *evam rkâra-lkârâu hrasvâv* (i 31) *iti vijñeyam*[5]

[1] W *hanvar*, B *h*, G M *hanor* [2] W om [3] G M *-nas-*, B *-ṅasamjñavâdâd* [4] G M ins *sâdhuh* [5] G M *jñeyam*

us for the utterance of the difficult *r* and *l* vowels By i 2, they are excluded from the category of simple homogeneous vowels For the teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas respecting them, see note to Ath Pr i 37 However they may have been pronounced at the period of grammatical treatment of the Vedic texts, we have no good reason to doubt that, at the time when those texts were composed, they were phonetically the same with the semi-vowels *r* and *l*, differing from them only as, for example, the *l* of *able* differs from that of *ably*, the *r* of (French) *aigre* from that of *aigri* For a theoretical discussion of this double value of the articulated sounds which lie nearly upon the boundary line between vowels and consonants, see Journ Am Or Soc viii 362 seq

एकेषामनुस्वारस्वरभक्त्योश्च ॥ १९ ॥

19 As also, according to some, in *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti*

In this case, we are told, the "also" (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding rule, and the meaning is, that there is approximation of the jaws in uttering *anusvâra*, and approach of the tip of the tongue to the gums in uttering the *svarabhakti*, according to the opinion of some, while others hold that *anusvâra* is simply nasal, and the *svarabhakti* (see xxi 15) equivalent to *r* This, the commentator adds, is Vararuci's explanation, and its truth is questionable We, in our turn, may regard it as matter for question whether this attribution and expression of doubt apply to the whole interpretation of the rule, or only to its concluding part, the statement of the opinion of "others" The latter is perhaps most probable

So far as regards *anusvâra*, we can hardly ascribe any value or propriety to this rule, the definition of *svarabhakti* in connection with that of the *r*-vowels is natural enough

अनादेशे प्रणयस्ता जिह्वा ॥ २० ॥

20 In the absence of special direction, the tongue is thrust down forward

When no such direction as "with the point of the tongue," "with

---

19 *cakârah pûrvoktavidhim anvâdiçati yathâsamkhyenâ*[1] *'nusvârasvarabhaktyoh pûrvoktavidhir bhavati anusvâre hanvor upasamhârah svarabhaktâu jihvâgrasya barsveshû 'pasamhârah etad ekeshâm matam anyeshâm tu matam anusvârasyâ 'nunâsikamâtratvam svarabhakter rkâratulyatvam iti vararucimatam*[2]. *tac cintyam*[3]

[1] G M *khyo* [2] G M *-ciracitam* [3] W *cityam*, B *cânityam*

the middle of the tongue" is given, then its position is to be understood as here directed To explain *pranyastâ*, the commentator gives, besides an ordinary analysis, the expression "in a quiescent state," as example, he cites *upa mâ* (iii 2 4[1] G and M spoil the citation by adding the following word, *dyâvâprthivî*), in the utterance of which words the tongue is not called perceptibly into action But this interpretation evokes a difficulty "since the position of quiescence is assured to all the articulating organs in the absence of any direction respecting them, of what use is this precept?" The reply is *e* (as taught by rule 17, above) is to be produced with the edges of the middle of the tongue, and the *a* contained in that letter is of the same character, hence it might be inferred, from the identity of the *a*-quality, that *a* was to be so uttered in other situations, as in words like *atha* (i 1 13[1] et al, if the word is to be regarded here as a citation)—a misapprehension which the rule removes To this reply the objection may be raised that our treatise acknowledges the presence of no such element as *a* in *e*, and that an *a* uttered with the middle of the tongue is a phonetic impossibility The direction respecting the tongue may well enough be regarded as a not entirely negative one, or it may have been deemed desirable to fix so very mobile and unruly a member by a special law *

अकारवदोष्ठौ ॥ २१ ॥

21 The lips are as in the utterance of *a*

We are directed to include in this rule, by vicinage, "in the absence of special direction" The proper position of the lips for uttering *a* was given in rule 12, above As illustration is added, quite needlessly, the word *indrah* (*passim*), the southern manuscripts read instead *indriyâvah* (vi 5 8[3])

---

20 *yatra jihvâgrena jihvâmadhyene 'ty âdir*[1] *anâdeças*[2] *tatra vishaye jihvâ pranyastâ tûshnîmbhûtâ*[3] *bhavati prakarshena nyastâ pranyasta*[4] *yathâ upa*.... *nanv anâdeçe sarvakaranânâm tûshnîmbhâvasiddheh kimartho 'yam ârambhah ucyate ekârasya jihvâmadhyântanishpâdyatvam*[5] *asti*[6] *tadavayavasyâ*[7] *'kârasya tathâtvam asti akâratvasâmyâd anyatrâ 'py athe 'ty âdâu tathâtvam prasajyeta tac câ 'nishtam tan mâ bhûd iti parihârah* [8]*nâ "deço 'nâdeçah*[8] *tasmin upadeçâbhâvâ ity arthah.*

[1] G M *âdinâ* [2] G M ins *anupadeçah* [3] W B *nibh-* [4] W B om [5] G M *dyamânatvam* [6] G M *asti 'ti* [7] G M ins *'pi* (8) W *anvâdeçah*, B *anadeçah*

21 *sâmnidhyâd anâdeça iti labhyate oshthayor yatrâ 'nâdeças tatrâ 'kâravad akâre yathâ tath"*[1] *oshthâu bhavatah nâ 'tyupasamhrtatarâv*[2] *ity arthah yathâ indra*[3] *iti*

[1] MSS *tathâ* [2] G M *hrtâv* [3] G M *indriyâva*

तालौ जिह्वामध्यमिवर्णे ॥ २२ ॥

22 In the *i* vowels, the middle of the tongue is to be approximated to the palate

The comment supplies, without remark, the predicate "to be approximated," and gives as example *ishe tvâ* (i.1 1 et al)

एकारे च ॥ २३ ॥

23 Also in *e*

Here the "also" (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding precept, both the specification of the active organ (*karana*) and that of the passive organ or place (*sthâna*) The exposition of the meaning of the rule is very simple and easy, but the commentator does not fail to notice that its necessity is open to objection upon two grounds, and enters into its defense at considerable length The first objection is, why make two separate rules (22 and 23) for a single direction?—that is to say, if the *i*-vowels and *e* are all produced by the approximation of the middle of the tongue to the palate, why not include them in one rule together? The answer given is that the degree of approximation is not the same in the two cases, but is less in the *e* than in the *i*-vowels If it be asked, why is this so? the reply is made, because the *e* is mixed with *a*, and production of this *a* with the middle of the tongue is on account of its constituting a part of *e*, and not by reason of its own natural character (compare the comment to rule 20, above)—which special qualification is sufficient ground for the less degree of approximation The second difficulty is stated thus both place and organ of *e* have been already defined in rules 15–17, above, but here is laid down for the same letter something different and it is not possible that both directions should be followed

---

22 *ivarne kârye jihvâmadhyam tâlâv upasamhartavyam yathâ ishe---- [1]jihvâyâ madhyam[1] jihvâmadhyam[2]*

(1) W om 2 B om

23 *cakârah pûrvavidhim anvâdiçati ekâre kârye [1]jihvâmadhyam tâlâv[1] upasamhartavyam[2] nanu vidhâu samâne prthaksûtrârambhah kimarthah[3] ucyate ivarne yathâ jihvâmadhyo pasamhâro na khalv evam ekâre kim tu tato[4] nyûna ity arthah kutâh akâramiçritatvâd ekârasya akârasya ca tadekadeçatvâj jihvâmadhyântanishpâdyatvam[5] na tu svatah ata eva sopâdhikatvân nyûnatvopapattih îshatprakrshtâv (ii 15) ity atra[6] sûtratrayenâi 'kârasya sthânakarane nirdishte iha tu tato [7]'nyat tasyâi[7] 'va nirdiçyate tad ekasminn ubhayathâ kartum na çakyate virodhât tasmâd atra yogavibhâgah kartavyah[8] avyañ-*

in the production of one sound To get rid of this difficulty, a division must be made, the former description must be understood as applying to *e* by itself, and the present one to *e* combined with a consonant How is this determination made? Why, when we say in a general way "the letter *e*," it lies nearest, or is most natural, to understand that letter itself, without a consonant, hence, because of its prior suggestedness, the first definition belongs to it, and the other is left, to be applied to the same sound as combined with a consonant

The utter artificiality of the answer to the second objection is too obvious to need pointing out, and even the first evokes more difficulties than it removes There is no inconsistency whatever between rules 17 and 23, and we have reason to be surprised only at the repetition in the latter of what is implied already in the former Rule 23 has the air of being an afterthought, slipped in, because of the really close relationship between *e* and *i*, with disregard of what had been taught before The alleged difference of degree of approximation exists clearly enough, but would be very insufficiently intimated by a mere separation of one rule into two

ओष्ठोपसंहार उवर्णे ॥ २४ ॥

24 In the *u*-vowels, there is approximation of the lips

After his paraphrase of the rule, the commentator enters here upon an exposition, the intent of which is not altogether clear to me "Here," he says, "approximation is as formerly, and not mere drawing down together" (that is, of the same kind as was taught in rule 14, above, and not the *prakrshtatâ*, 'protraction,' of rule 15, which is there glossed by *samnikrshtatâ*?) "However, 'the lips drawn down together may be long'—this will be said hereafter" (by this phrase some direction given later in the treatise is

---

jane tal lakshanam savyañjane tv etad iti kuto 'yam niyamah ucyate [9]*ekâra iti*[9] *sâmânyoktâu satyâm* [10]*prathamam avyañjanasyâi*[10] *'va grahanam mukhyam*[11] *tathâ sati prathamapratîtes*[12] *tasmin prathamam lakshanam yujyate savyañjane*[13] *pâriçeshyâd etad iti vijñeyam*

(1) W G M *dhyantav* 2 G M *vyâu* 3 G M *-tham* 4 G M *ato* 5 B *dhyântabhyâm nish*, G M *dhyanish* 6 G M om (7) W *nyasyai*, B *nye t* 8 G M om (9) G M *ekârasya*, (10) B *pratham av-*, G M *-mam vy-* 11 W *sukaram* 12 G M *-mam pra* 13 G M ins *tu*

24 *uvarne kârya oshthopasamhâro bhavati atro 'pasamhârah pûrvavan na samnikrshtatâmâtram kim tu samnikrshtâv oshthâu dîrghâu syâtâm iti vakshyate evam oshthâu tu 'pasamhrtatarâv* (ii 14) *ity atrâ 'pi vijñeyam. yathâ ul-.... oshthayor upasamhâra oshthopasamhârah*[1]

1 W B om

wont to be cited, but there is no such direction as this, either in text or in commentary), "the same is to be understood in rule 14, above" (compare a similar reference to a preceding rule in the comment to ii 18) A phrase is then cited from the Sanhitâ, containing *u* and *û*, namely *ulûkhalabudhno yûpah* (vii 2 1³)

एकान्तरस्तु सर्वत्र प्रकृतात् ॥ २५ ॥

25 But, in all cases, with an interval of one from the preceding

The commentary on this very obscure rule reads as follows

By vicinage, "labial approximation" is here implied everywhere, in the case of labial vowels, after the preceding labial approximation, a separate labial approximation is to be made, provided it have an interval of one by this is understood having the quantity of a *mora* interposed that, namely, has an interval of one whereof one *mora* is the interval or interposition This is the distinctive condition of the separate labial approximation The word "but" (*tu*) denies the necessity of the interval of one in a case where *o* [W says, where *âu* or *v*] follows Examples are *utpûtaçushmam* (i 6 1¹), *sûnnîyam iti su unnîyam* (vi 2 4¹), *atho oshadhîshu* (iii 5 5² and vi 3 9⁵), *bâhuvor balam* (v 5 9²), *tanuvâu ghorâ 'nyâ* (v 7 3³ G M omit the last word), *caturhotâ* (not found in the Sanhitâ occurs Tâitt Brâh ii 2 3²)

Objection in *yo 'ñçum* (iii 3 4³), the *anusvâra* has a *mora* [by i 34] and the *ç* a half-*mora* [by i 37], since, then, the quantity being a *mora* and a half, there is not an interval of one, how is the separate labial approximation assured?

Answer it is assured by the principle "a hundred includes fifty" Where there is a *mora* and a half, there is *à fortiori* a *mora*, in virtue of this the prescribed effect is produced, but its excess does not vitiate the rule, because the word "one" excludes what does not belong to itself (?) For the same reason, the occurrence

---

25 *sâmnidhyâd oshthopasamhâra iti labhyate sarvatr' oshthyasvareshu prakrtâd oshthopasamhârât prthagoshthopasamhârah* [1]*kartavyah sa ced ekântarah*[1] *ekântara iti mâtrâkâlavyavâya*[2] *iti labhyate*[3] *ekamâtrâ 'ntaram vyavadhânam yasyâ 'sâv ekântarah iti prthagoshthopasamhârasya viçeshanam tuçabda okâraparatva*[4] *ekântaratvaniyamam*[5] *nivartayati udâharanâni ut-*[6] *sûn-.... atho.... bâh-.... tan-.... cat-.... nanu yo.... ity atrâ 'nusvârasya mâtrâkâlah* [7]*çakârasyâ 'rdhamâtrâkâlah* [7] *evam adhyardhamâtratve saty ekântaratvâbhâvât*[8] *katham prthagoshthopasamhârasiddhih ucyate çatepañcâçannyâyena sidhyati adhyardhamâtratve 'py*[9] *ekamâtratvam sutarâm*[10] *asti tena kâryam bhavaty adhikam tu na nishidhyate svâyogavyavachedakatvâd ekaçabdasya ata eva bâh-.... ity âder*[11] *na*

of the double labial in such passages as *bâhuvor balam ûruvor ojah* (v 5 9²; G M omit the last word) is not primary (or original), but its quality as *sphurita*, 'quavered,' is shown by the likeness of the example (?)

Second objection then why is there not a separate labial approximation in the two *u*'s following the *k* and *r* of *kusurubindah* (vii 2 2¹), since there occurs more than a *mora* and a half of interval between them?

Answer not so, here there is denial of separate labiality only for the two *u*'s that follow *k* and *s*, because of the absence of its necessary condition, but to that following the *r* this rule does not apply, because it is not a case of separateness from the preceding, but of separateness from the *u* that follows the intermediate *s*, this being so, there is no occurrence of the interval of one for a letter in this situation thus there is no offense against the rule

So far the comment, but either I have failed to apprehend its true meaning, or it has given a false interpretation to the rule, or the rule itself is destitute of intelligible significance I must confess myself unable to see what peculiarity there should be in the utterance of two labial vowels following one another in two successive syllables with not less than a *mora*'s interval between them No precept, so far as I know, in any of the other Prâtiçâkhyas, is analogous with this, or casts light upon it

It appears to be intimated, in the course of the answer to the first objection, that the peculiar utterance of the *u* in such words as *bâhuvoh* for the usual *bâhvoh* and *ûruvoh* for *ûrvoh* is denominated *sphurita* The term does not occur elsewhere, nor is any notice taken of the phenomenon, if not here It is a well-known characteristic of Tâittirîya texts, but is found in fewer words than one would be apt to imagine Besides the two just given, I have noted in the Sanhitâ only the cases of *tanû* (*tanuvam*, e g i 1 8, *tanuvâ*, e g i 1 10²) and the word *suvar*, which are often met with Of similar resolutions of an *i*-vowel into *iy*, the cases are more nu-

---

dviroshthyam[12] *mukhyam kim tu sphuritatvam*[13] *udâharanatvâbhâsatayâ*[14] *darçitam tarhi kus- ity atra kakârarephâbhyâm uttarayor ukârayoh katham prthagoshthopasamhâro na bhavati adhyardhamâtravyavâyasambhavât*[15] *mâi 'vam atra*[16] *kakârasakârottarayor*[17] *ukârayos tâvad*[18] *aprthagoshthatâ*[19] *etallakshanâsambhavât rephâd uttarasya tu*[20] *prakrtât prthaktvâbhâvân nâ 'yam vidhih* [21]*kim tu*[21] *madhyasthasakârottarâd ukârât prthaktvam tathâ saty ekântarâbhâvah*[22] *tadavastha*[23] *eve 'ti lakshanam idam avyabhicaritam*[24].

(1) W om ² G M *labhedavy* ³ G M *arthah* ⁴ W *âukâravakârap-* ⁵ G M *ekamâtranantaratva* ⁶ G M om (7) B om ⁸ G M *ekaratv-* ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ W *muttarâm* ¹¹ G M *âddu* ¹² G M *thyatvam* ¹³ G M *svar-* ¹⁴ W *-haratva-*, B *-tvabh* , G M *nan tu âbh* ¹⁵ G M *vyavadhânas-* ¹⁶ G M om ¹⁷ G M *-râbhyâm utt* ¹⁸ G M *van* ¹⁹ G M *na prthagoshthasamhâratâ* ²⁰ W *u*, B om (21) W B om ²² G M *-vât* ²³ W *sthay*, B *sthâ* ²⁴ G M *vyabh-*

merous, but less frequent I have collected the following (without exhausting the Sanhitâ, especially of themes in *iya*) *ágriya* (iv 5 5[2]), *aghniya* (i 1 1), *áçviya* (ii 2 12[3]), *asmadrîyañc* (i 4 21), *îdhríya* (iv 5 7[2]), *dhíshniya* (iii 1 3[1]), *pâ'triya* (iii 2 3[3]), *budhníya* (i 3 3), *réshmiya* (iv 5 7[2]), *viçvápsniyâ* (i 5 3[3]), *viçvadrîyañc* (i 7 13[3]), *vr'shniya* (iii 2 5[3]), *çî'ghriya* (iv 5 5[2]), *sadhríyañc* (i 2 14[5]), and, of oblique cases from themes in *i* or *î*, *indrâgniyóh* (i 3 12), *gâyatriyâ'* (iii 2 9[1]), *pâ'rshniyâ* (iv 6 9[2]), *pr'çniyâi* (ii 2 11[4]), *râ'triyâi* (iv 4 1[1]), *lakshmíyâ* (ii 1 5[2]), *viçpátniyâi* (iii 1 11[4]), *svâdhíyam* (i 3 14[6]) None of the consonantal combinations which are thus avoided by the resolution of the *u* are such as the euphony of the Tâittirîyakas does not tolerate but of those which are avoided by the resolution of the *i*, only three are met with in the text—namely, *try* (e g i 8 22[1] ii 4 3[1]), *tny* (iv 4 2[2]), and *çny* (v 5 6[3]) I have not entered deeply enough into the investigation to deduce the law, if law there be, by which the resolution is made

अकारार्धमैकारौकारयोरादिः ॥ २६ ॥

26 The beginning of *âi* and *âu* is half an *a*

Rules 28 and 29, below, tell of what constitutes the remainder of these diphthongs

संवृतकरणतरमेकेषाम् ॥ २७ ॥

27 Which, in the opinion of some, is uttered with the organs more closed

We have here another indication that, as intimated above (under ii 12), our Prâtiçâkhya does not recognize the close or neutral pronunciation of the short *a*, for, if it did so, there would obviously be no reason for referring to the opinion held by certain authorities respecting its assumption of that utterance in diphthongal combination Some phonetists (without sufficient reason, as it appears to me) have in like manner defined the first element in our English diphthongs ("long *i*" in *aisle*, *isle*, and *ou* or *ow* in *house*, *down*) to be the neutral vowel (*u* in *but*), rather than the open *a* (of *far*) But, whatever may have been the case with the Sanskrit diphthongs, our own cannot be truly described as composed of two elements each they are slides, and to allow the organs to remain in

---

26 *âikârasyâu "kârasya câ "dir akârârdham bhavati akârasyâ 'rdham akârârdham*

27 *sâmnidhyâd akârârdham iti labhyate ekeshâm mate tac akârârdham samvrtakaranataram bhavati samvrtâni samnikrshtâni karanâni yasya tat samvrtakaranam atiçayena samvrtakaranam samvrtakaranataram*

B reads *samvrtta* throughout

either their first or last position long enough to make the initial or final element distinctly audible, would be an error of pronunciation The commentator glosses *samvrta*, 'enveloped, shut up, closed,' with *sannikrshta*, 'drawn down together, approximated'

इकारो ऽध्यर्धः पूर्वस्य शेषः ॥ २८ ॥

28 Of the former, the rest is one and a half times *i*

Of the former—that is, of *āi*, *āi* and *āu* having been mentioned together in a preceding rule (ii 26), says the commentator

उकारस्तूत्तरस्य ॥ २९ ॥

29 But, of the latter, *u*

That is to say, the remainder of *āu* is one and a half times *u* To account for the word "but" (*tu*) in the rule, the commentator notes that, as the beginning of both diphthongs is the same sound, *a*, it might seem to follow that their end would be the same sound, *i* this the "but" denies This explanation merely intensifies and makes too precise the actual meaning of the word

For the teachings of the other Prātiçākhyas as to the pronunciation of *āi* and *āu*, see the note to Ath Pr i 40 As there remarked, the euphonic treatment which they receive proves their first element to have had originally more than a half-*mora* of quantity If they must be limited to two *moras*, a better description of them would have been $1\frac{1}{2}a+\frac{1}{2}i$, and $1\frac{1}{2}a+\frac{1}{2}u$ If, as we may presume to be the case, the authors of these treatises defined their own pronunciation pretty accurately, then the *āi* and *āu*, not less than the *e* and *o*, had by their time taken on a value notably different from that which belonged to them when the euphonic rules of the language were the faithful representation of living processes

अनुस्वारोत्तमा अनुनासिकाः ॥ ३० ॥

30 *Anusvāra* and the last mutes are nasal

As example of *anusvāra*, the comment cites *yo 'n̐çum* (iii 3 4[3]),

---

28 *pūrvasyāi "kārasye 'ty arthah adhastād*[1] *āikārāukārayoh sahoccaritatvāt*[2] *adhyardha ikāra āikārasya çesho bhavati adhikam ardham yasyā 'sāv adhyardhah*

[1] W *adhyardhas tāvad* [2] G M *uccar-*

29. *uttarasyāu "kārasye 'ty arthah adhyardha ukāra āukāraçesho*[1] *bhavati yathā 'nayor ubhayor apy ādir akāra eva tadvad ikāra eva çeshah*[2] *prasaktah tan*[3] *nishedhati tuçabdah.*

[1] G M *-rasya çe* [2] W B om [3] W B *tam*

of the "last" or nasal mutes, *pratyañ hotâram* (vi 3 1[5])—to which G M add *prâñcam upa* (v 2 7[3]), and *manmâ* (vii 3 14)

The term *anunâsika* is interpreted by the commentator as signifying *nâsikâm anuvartate*, 'it goes after the nostril'—that is to say, doubtless, 'it finds exit by the nasal passages' an accurate definition of this class of sounds As employed in this Prâtiçâkhya, *anunâsika* means simply, as adjective, 'nasal,' and its derivative noun, *ânunâsikya*, signifies 'nasality, nasal utterance' Rule 52, below, describes how such mode of utterance is produced, and in chapter xvii (rules 1–4) is made an attempt to define the degree of nasality in the various sounds of the class "Nasal," or *anunâsika*, by the present rule, are the *anusvâra* and the five nasal mutes, *ṅ*, *ñ*, *ṇ*, *n*, *m*; the same term is applied later to the nasal semivowels into which *n* and *m* (v 26–28) are under certain circumstances convertible, and at v 31, x 11, xv 1,6, xxii 14, we also hear of nasal (*anunâsika*) vowels The other nose-sounds, the *yamas* and *nâsikya* (ii 49,50, xxi 8,12–14), do not anywhere receive this title

It is desirable to put together somewhere a comprehensive statement of the doctrines held by the Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya respecting the nasal constituents of the alphabet it recognizes, and no more suitable place is likely to present itself than is offered here

All nasal (*anunâsika*) sounds are uttered (ii 52) by the mouth and nose together An *uttama*, a "last" or nasal mute, is a sound in the production of which the intonated breath escapes through the nose, while the organs of the mouth form one of those same contacts which give rise to the corresponding non-nasal mutes of the series In *anusvâra*, on the other hand (including under that designation the nasal semivowels, of which more further on), the mouth-organs are not wholly closed, but the intonated breath finds exit through them at the same time that it passes through the nasal cavities In all cases, then, in which the character of the nasal of a syllable is determined by that of the following consonant, the nasal will be a mute if the latter is a mute, but an *anusvâra* if succeeded by a letter not forming a contact—by a semivowel or a spirant Respecting the phonetic character and occurrence of the nasal mutes, there has been no difference of opinion, so far as we have any information, among the Hindu phoneticists of the period represented by the Prâtiçâkhyas, none of them has allowed a final *anusvâra* before a pause, or an *anusvâra* before a mute, either in the same or a following word As to the phonetic value, however, of the real *anusvâra*, the nasal uttered with open mouth-organs, there was by no means the same accordance among those ancient grammarians Some held it to be a pervading nasalization of the preceding vowel, others, a nasal addition to

---

30 *anusvâraç co 'ttamâç câ 'nunâsikâ bhavanti nâsikâm anuvartanta ity anunâsikâh yathâ anusvârah yo---- uttamâç ca*[1] *pra----* [2]*prâ---- man-*[2]

[1] G M ins *yathâ* [(2)] W B om

that vowel. The former view is adopted and consistently maintained by the Atharva-Prâtiçâkhya, which acknowledges nasal consonants and nasalized vowels, but no *tertium quid*. The Prâtiçâkhyas of the Rik and White Yajus are equally consistent in their recognition of an *anusvâra* as nasal appendage to the vowel, and the latter of them gives (Vâj. Pr. iv. 147–8) detailed directions as to the quantity belonging to each element. The Tâittirîya Prâtiçâkhya adopts prevailingly the same view, but lets the other appear distinctly in some of its rules. Thus, at v. 31, it is stated to be Âtreya's opinion that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the preceding vowel is nasalized; and, in conformity with this, xv. 1 directly teaches that, after the various conversion of *m* and *n*, the vowel before them becomes nasal, the following rules adding (xv. 2,3) that some authorities deny this, and direct *anusvâra* to be inserted instead: here the commentary has to reverse the obvious intent of the text, and declare the latter rules approved, and the first disapproved. Further, x. 11 directs that when a vowel is combined with a nasalized vowel the result is nasal (the commentary, however, gives a different interpretation: see the rule). Once more, in xxii. 14, among "heavy" syllables is reckoned one that is *anunâsika*, 'nasal.'

I very much doubt whether this difference of views is founded upon an actual difference of pronunciation; it is probably due rather to a discordant apprehension and analysis of a single mode of utterance. The same point might divide into two parties our phonetists at the present day—just as they have long been divided upon the question whether a *b* differs from a *p* in being sonant, or in being soft, or weak, or of inferior aspiration, or something of that kind. Without entering into any detailed discussion of the subject, I will simply say that I incline to side with the Atharvan school, and to believe in nasal vowels rather than in *anusvâra*. No one of the Prâtiçâkhyas gives an intelligible definition of the phonetic character of *anusvâra*, considered as an independent alphabetic element; if it is to be so considered, we shall hardly be able to make of it anything but a bit of the neutral vowel (*u* of *but*) nasalized, or the sound of the French *un*, and shall have to regard it as attached to the vowel much in the same way as, by us who speak English, the same sound not nasalized is attached to most of our long vowels before an *r*—for example, in *there*, *here*, *oar*, *cure*, *fire*, *sour* (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii. 353).

Which of the two views is originally favored by the Devanâgarî alphabet does not admit of much question; the writing of *amça*, for example,* with a nasal sign over the vowel of the first syllable, is an unequivocal recognition of the nasality as something affecting the vowel itself. If it had seemed to the framers of this alphabet to be a something interposed between the vowel and the following consonant, they would doubtless have

* Namely, अंशा, or अँशा.

found for it a sign to stand between those of the other elements This has actually been done, out of a true regard for consistency, by the writers of the Vâjasaneyi and Tâittirîya texts for lack of a better device, they have brought down one of the usual signs of nasality from above the syllable to a position between the syllables, giving it an addition which enables it to maintain its place there* —in the Tâittirîya texts, we have the dotted crescent, with the *virâma*, the usual mark for a consonant not graphically combined with a following consonant, beneath it The scribes of the Rig-Veda seem to have been less solicitous to make their practice square with their theory It may well be made a question, however, whether the habit, now so common, of writing *amka*, *amta*, *ambâ*, for *añka*, *anta*, *ambâ*, etc ,† could have grown up until the opinion had become prevalent that the nasal sign in *amça* also represented a nasal sound which followed the vowel, and was accommodated in its special mode of utterance to its successor ‡

One more point in the theory of the nasal sounds calls for notice The assimilation of *n* to a following *l*, and of *m* to a following *l*, *y*, or *v* (v 26–8), is treated by the Tâittirîya, the Vâjasaneyi, and the Rik Prâtiçâkhyas as resulting in the production, not of *anusvâra*, but of a nasal counterpart to the semivowel—that is, the case is made analogous with that of a nasal before a mute, instead of before a spirant Here, also, the Atharva-Prâtiçâkhya pursues an independent course, and accepts no nasal *y* or *v*, but only a nasal *l*, as product of both *m* and *n* (see Ath Pr ii 35) In this case, as well as in the other, we have to asssume merely a difference in the theoretical explanation of an identical mode of pronunciation, and I should not only favor the Atharvan view, but should be willing to give up the nasal *l* itself, as not worth distinguishing from an ordinary case of *anusvâra*—or of nasalized vowel, if we accept this understanding of the matter Thus much, indeed, may be allowed —that, while the absence of sonant utterance in the spirants cuts them off from sharing in a nasal quality, it might be difficult to prevent the nasality of the preceding vowel from infecting at least

---

* Thus, for अंश or अँश, the Vaj S writes अ६श, the Taitt S अꣳश

† That is, अंक, अंत, अंबा, for अङ्क, अन्त, अम्बा

‡ No valid objection can be raised against the practically so convenient, imitation of this habit on the part of modern European scholars, so far as concerns the representation of an original *m* assimilated to a following consonant To go farther than this, however, and write the *anusvara* sign in the interior of a word for a nasal mute which is equally radical or thematic with the succeeding non nasal, and, yet more, to write it for a final *m*, which no Prâtiçâkhya allows to be pronounced otherwise than *m*, seems an indefensible practice, and one wholly to be disapproved and rejected Of Muller's seemingly elaborate defense of his adherence to it, given in the Preface to his Hitopadeça, absolutely the whole point lies in the phrases (p xi) "it is easier to write *amkitâ* than *ankitâ* What applies to writing applies with still greater force to printing"—which latter consideration must be pronounced destitute of weight, since, on the contrary, we *do* expect our printing to be superior in accuracy to ordinary writing

the beginning of the sonant semivowels For the exclusion of *r* from the same treatment with the other semivowels I can discover no good reason.

The usage of the manuscripts is pretty nearly in accordance with the theories of the Prâtiçâkhya For an assimilated *m*, the distinctive *anusvâra* sign is always written before *r*, as before the spirants, but before *l*, *y*, and *v* is written the sign of nasality above the preceding syllable, as before a mute But as regards *n* before *l*, my manuscript varies with complete irregularity between treating it like *m*, as required by the Prâtiçâkhya, and writing the *n* unchanged, either with *virâma* or conjoined with the *l* (instances of the latter mode of treatment are about twice as frequent as of the former) The edited text more usually follows a third method, supported neither by my manuscript nor by the Prâtiçâkhya it writes the *l* double, and puts a sign of nasality over the preceding syllable This is nonsense if two *l*'s are written, the first should be separated from the other, and should have the sign of nasality written above it But there is no reason why this should be done in the case of a combination of *l* with *n* any more than with *m*, or than in the combination of *m* with *y* and *v*

It only remains to add that, in my manuscripts (T and W) and those at Berlin and Oxford (B and O), the text of the Prâtiçâkhya follows, in regard to the treatment of the nasals as to other points of euphony, the usages of the Tâittirîya text, and that the citations from the latter in the commentary are also written accordingly, while the body of the commentary itself follows the methods of ordinary Sanskrit texts In this edition, therefore, their example is followed as closely as possible the proper *anusvâra* being represented by ṁ, and the *m* assimilated to a mute or semivowel, by *m* The two South-Indian manuscripts (G and M) do not distinguish these two from one another

स्वराणां यत्रोपसंहारस्तत्स्थानम् ॥ ३१ ॥

31 In the case of the vowels, that is their place of production, to which approximation is made

The term *upasamhâra*, 'approximation,' is glossed by *upaçleshaviçeshah*, 'a sort of embrace'—unless, indeed, we are to read, with G and M, *samçleshaviçleshah*, 'disunion of embrace,' i. e., 'embrace which does not come to actual contact'

The terms *sthâna*, 'place,' and *karana*, 'organ,' denote, as in the other Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath Pr i 18), the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth whose concurrence gives birth to a sound

---

31 *svarânâm tat sthânam bhavati*[1] *yatro 'pasamhârah syât upasamhâro nâmo 'paçleshaviçeshah*[2]

[1] B om [2] W *'paçlosh*, G M *samçleshaviçleshah*

यदुपसंहरति तत्करणम् ॥ ३२ ॥

32 That is producing organ, which makes the approximation

Here, "in the case of the vowels" is declared to be implied from the preceding rule, *upasamharati*, 'approaches,' is explained by *prâpayati*, 'attains,' and, as example of a *karana*, or producing organ, reference is made to the "tip of the tongue," spoken of in rule 18 of this chapter

अन्येषां तु यत्र स्पर्शनं तत्स्थानम् ॥ ३३ ॥

33 But in the case of the other letters, that is place of production, where contact is made

By this expression, the commentator says, simple embrace or union is predicated of the consonants, while above a sort of embrace (or disunion of embrace) was predicated of the vowels The difference, he adds, between approximation and contact will be inferred by any knowing person from the force of the terms themselves The word "but" (*tu*) is meant to exclude the vowels, or, as Mâhisheya explains it, annuls for *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti* the quality of being produced by contact merely, like the other consonants This last is a precious bit of pregnant construction, and the whole comment is more obscure than the rule itself, whose meaning and implication are sufficiently obvious

येन स्पर्शयति तत्करणम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34 That is producing organ, whereby one makes the contact

The commentator supplies, as subject of the verb, the noun *adhyetâ*, 'reader'—or, rather, 'repeater'

---

32 *svarânâm iti sâmnidhyâl labhyate svarânâm tat karanam bhavati yat svarân upasamharati prâpayati* [1]*tat karanam*[1] *yathâ jihvâgram rkâra* (ii 18) *ity âdi*

[1] B *tat sthanam*, G M om

33 *svarebhyo 'nyeshâm varnânâm tat sthânam yatra sparçanam bhavet atra vyañjanânâm samçleshamâtram*[1] *kathyate svarânâm tu*[2] *purastât samçleshah*[3] *kathitah upasamhârasparçanayoh*[4] *çabdaçaktyâ viçesho* [5] *vidushâ vijñeyah*[6] *tuçabdah*[7] *svaranivrttyarthah athavâ*[8] *anusvârasvarabhaktyor vyañjanavat*[9] *sparçanamâtrakatvanivartaka*[10] *iti mâhisheyabhâshitam*

[1] W *çlosh-*, G M *-mâtratvam* [2] W om [3] G *-shaviçeshah*, M *shaviçleshah* [4] G M *-hâra iti sparçana* [5] G M ins *eva* [6] G M *jñatavyah* [7] G M *çabda* [8] G M om [9] W *-nave*, B *na* [10] B *sparçakamnama-*, G M *sparçamatrakalan niv-*, M *-vartata*

In these four rules is implied that distinction of opener and closer position between vowel and consonant which constitutes their essential difference (see Journ Am Or Soc'y, viii 367 seq), and which the Ath Pr states more fully (i 29–35 —where, in rule 33, we should read *eke 'sprshtam*), with specifications of degree of openness and closure which are here omitted (save so far as represented by rule 45, below)

हनूमूले जिह्वामूलेन कवर्गे स्पर्शयति ॥ ३५ ॥

35 In the *k* series, one makes contact with the root of the tongue at the root of the jaws

Compare Ath Pr i 20, and the references to the other Prâtiçâkhyas there given

The locative and instrumental cases, in this and the following rules, correspond with the *yatra*, 'where,' and *yena*, 'whereby,' of rules 33 and 34, above, and point out respectively the place and organ of production of the different classes of sounds

The singular number of *hanûmûla*, 'root of the jaws,' the commentator accounts for as used generically (*jâtyapekshâyâm*, 'with reference to the whole kind or class')

तालौ जिह्वामध्येन चवर्गे ॥ ३६ ॥

36 In the *c*-series, with the middle of the tongue, upon the palate

Compare Ath Pr i 21, and the note upon it The sonant aspirate of this series, *jh*, is not met with in the text

जिह्वाग्रेण प्रतिवेष्ट्य मूर्धनि टवर्गे ॥ ३७ ॥

37 In the *t* series, with the tip of the tongue, rolled back, in the head.

Compare Ath Pr i 22, and the note upon it Our commentary says, "by the word 'head' (*mûrdhan*) is intended the upper part

---

34 *sâmnidhyâd anyeshâm iti labhyate svarebhyo 'nyeshâm varnânâm tat karanam bhavati adhyetâ yena vyañjanâni sparçayati prâpayati tat karanam*

35 *kavarga uccâryamâne jihvâmûlena* [1] *hanûmûle sparçayati prâpayed ity arthah hanvor mûlam hanûmûlam*[2] *tasmin*[3] [4] *jâtyapekshâyâm*[5] *ekavacanam*

[1] G M ins *varnam* [2] B G M om [3] W B om [4] G M ins *mûlam iti* [5] W *-ksham*

36 *çavarge kârye* [1] *jihvâmadhyena varnân*[2] *tâlâu sprçet*[3].

[1] G M put *tâlâu* here [2] M *-nam* [3] B *sprçayet*, G M *sparçayet.*

of the mouth-cavity" Perhaps we shall best remove the difficulties attaching to the use of the word "head" in describing this class of sounds, by assuming that the name *mûrdhanya*, 'capital,' had become firmly established in use as designating them, at an earlier period of phonetic science in India, when their mode of production was less accurately understood and defined, and was therefore retained by the later grammarians, who gave to it a new definition For, that *mûrdhan* should have been taken directly and without ceremony to signify the 'dome of the palate' does not appear to me possible As in the notes to the Atharva-Prâtiçâkhya, I shall take the liberty of speaking of the *t*-sounds as "lingual"—a term, on the whole, as unobjectionable and as commonly accepted as any other

The commentator glosses the word *prativeshtya*, 'having rolled it back,' by "having done what? having rolled back (G M add in explanation *âveshtya*, 'having rolled up') the tip of the tongue, on account of its suitableness" (i e of the adaptedness of this position to produce the contact aimed at)

जिह्वाग्रेण तवर्गे दन्तमूलेषु ॥ ३८ ॥

38 In the *t*-series, with the tip of the tongue, at the roots of the teeth

Compare Ath Pr i 24, and the note upon it

ओष्ठाभ्यां पवर्गे ॥ ३९ ॥

39 In the *p* series, with the two lips

The commentator explains that here the upper lip is the place of production, as the various places of production mentioned have been the upper organ, and that the under lip is the organ of production

Compare Ath Pr i 25, and the note upon it

---

37 *tavarge kârye jihvâgrena* [1] *mûrdhni*[2] *varnam sprçet*[3] *kim krtvâ yogyatvâj*[4] *jihvâgram prativeshtya*[5] *mûrdhaçabdena vaktravivaroparibhâgo vivakshyate*[6]

[1] G M put *varnam* here [2] B G M *murdhani* [3] B *sprçayet* [4] W *-tva*, B *tvat taj*, G *-tvâñ*, M *tvâyogyatvâñ* [5] G M *-shtyâveshtya* [6] G M *-kshitah*

38 *tavarge kârye jihvâgrena varnam dantamûleshu sparçayet*[1].

[1] G M *sprçet*

39 *pavarge kârya oshthâbhyâm anyonyam sparçayet atro*[1] *'ttaroshtha sthânam uttaratvasâmyâd*[2] *eshâm sthânânâm adharoshthah karanam*

[1] W *tatro* [2] B *-râtvât sâmânyâd*, G M *oshthatva*

तालौ जिह्वामध्यान्ताभ्यां यकारे ॥ ४० ॥

40 In *y*, with the two edges of the middle of the tongue, upon the palate

The Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya stands alone in omitting to rank the semi-vowels along with the mutes, as palatal, etc , and in describing their formation throughout by special rule Respecting *y*, see the note to Ath Pr i 21

The description of the mode of production of *y*, here given, is quite accurate and sufficiently distinctive The "edges" are mentioned, as being the parts which form contact with the palate, the central part remaining open, as taught for *i* in rule 22, above

रेफे जिह्वाग्रमध्येन प्रत्यग्दन्तमूलेभ्यः ॥ ४१ ॥

41 In *r*, with the middle of the tip of the tongue, back of the roots of the teeth

Pratyak is explained by the phrase, "in the interior upper portion"—that is, 'within and above'—the equivalence of *pratyagâtman* and *antarâtman*, 'inner soul,' being pleaded as justification

The somewhat discordant teachings of the Prâtiçâkhyas with reference to this sound are detailed in the note to Ath Pr i 28 The most noteworthy circumstance in their common treatment of the letter is that they so ignore its special relationship with the lingual mutes, and in part with the *r*-vowels although in this treatise the definition of the latter (ii 18) is, essentially, nearly accordant with that here given for the semivowel *R* could not possibly have the value which belongs to it in the Sanskrit euphonic system, if it were not a lingual semi-vowel, like the English *r*, uttered with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate

दन्तमूलेषु च लकारे ॥ ४२ ॥

42 Also in *l*, at the roots of the teeth

According to the commentator, the "and" (*ca*) of this rule brings down by implication from the preceding both *jihvâgramadhya*, 'middle of the tongue-tip,' and *pratyak*, 'back from' It

---

40 *yakâre kârye jihvâmadhyântâbhyâm tâlâu sparçayet jihvâyâ madhyam tasyâ 'ntâu tâbhyâm jihvâmadhyântâbhyâm*[1].

[1] G M om

41 *rephe kârye jihvâgramadhyena dantamûlebhyah pratyak sparçayet pratyag ity* [1]*abhyantara uparibhâga*[1] *ity arthah* [2]*yah pratyagâtme 'ty*[2] *antarâtmâ pratîyate*

(1) G M *-ntaropari* (2) G M *yathâ pratyagâtmani*

appears obvious, however, if only from the locative case of *dantamûleshu*, that the latter item is not intended, and that we are to regard the roots of the teeth themselves (more properly, the gums close upon them) as the *sthâna*, or 'place of production,' of *l* This, indeed, is nearly enough intimated by the final paraphrase of the comment The really distinctive characteristic of the *l*, that it forms a contact in front, but allows the breath to escape at the sides of the tongue, is here by no means clearly brought out rather, we are left to infer that it and the *r* are produced in the same manner, only the *r* a little further back. No one of the other treatises gives a better description (see note to Ath Pr i 24, where I have given the Tâittirîya definition more credit than really belongs to it)

ओष्ठान्ताभ्यां दन्तैर्वकारे ॥ ४३ ॥

43 In *v*, with the edges of the lips, along with the teeth

This rule cannot be commended for distinctness The commentator gives it not a little of additional precision, by his paraphrase "with the two edges of the lower lip, along with the points of the upper teeth" But how comes the lower lip to have two edges? He adds, that the teeth are the place, and the lips the organ, of production But then why does not the rule read *danteshu*, instead of the instrumental *dantâih*? It gives us two instrumentals, as if teeth and lips were joint organs, and neither of them any more "place" than the other The lower lip, being the more passive organ, should be the "place" on which the teeth, as "organ," make their contact, but from taking this view the treatise and its comment appear to be hindered by the analogy of the other *sthâna*'s, which have uniformly been the upper of the two parts concerned in the contact To make a good definition, the rule should read *adharoshthânte* for *oshthântâbhyâm*

Of the other treatises (as pointed out in the note to Ath Pr i 25), the Vâj Pr gives the *v* a description corresponding with this, and showing the letter to have had the precise phonetic value of our English *v* This, of course, should not in the least stand in the way of our fully recognizing the fact that its original sound was that of our *w* The *w* is a semi-vowel, standing in the same relation to *u* as *y* to *i*, but to call *v* a semi-vowel is a sim-

---

42 *cakâro* [1]*jihvâgramadhyapratyaktvam anvâdiçati*[1] *lakâre kârye jihvâgramadhyena*[2] *dantamûleshu pratyak sparçayet*[3] *ayam arthah lakârasya* [4]*dantamûlapratyâsannam pratyagantarapradeçasthânam*[4] *iti vijñeyam*[5]

(1) G M *jihvâmadhyam pratyaktvam câ "karshati* [2] G M *hvâmadh* [3] W B put after *vijñeyam* (4) G M *-sannapradeça sthânam* [5] G M *jñeyam*

43 *vakâre kârye 'dharoshthântâbhyâm uttaradantâgrâih saha sparçayet dantâir iti sthânanirdeçah. oshthântâbhyâm iti karananirdeçah.*

ple abuse of terms We might nearly as well call our *j* a semivowel, because it is written with an originally vocalic sign, and represents in the majority of cases a sound which the Romans pronounced as *y*

स्पर्शस्थानेषूष्माण आनुपूर्व्येण ॥ ४४ ॥

44 The spirants, in their order, are produced in the places of the mutes

By rule i 9, there are six spirants, and as there are but five "places" of mutes, these belong to the first five spirants, as is signified by the expression "in their order" *h*, therefore, is omitted, and its rules will be given hereafter (rules 46,47) To this effect the commentator, who also allots the spirants to their respective mute classes, and cites from the Sanhitâ an example for each namely, for *jihvâmûlîya*, uttered in the place of a *k*-mute, *yah kâmayeta* (ii 3 2⁴ et al I follow the example of all the MSS, and do not attempt to distinguish the guttural and labial spirants from *visarjanîya* by different signs), for *ç*, in the place of a *c*-mute, *madhuç ca mâdhavaç ca* (i 4 14, or iv 4 11¹ W B omit the last two words of the citation, and W reads *manyuç ca*, which is found at iv 7 2¹), for *sh*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *ashtâbhyah svâhâ* (vii 2 15), for *s*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *stanâ uparavâh* (vi 2 11⁴), and for *upadhmânîya*, in the place of a *p*-mute, *yah pâpmanâ* (ii 3 13²)

To make this rule a definition of the mode of utterance of the spirants, the one next following is to be applied to modify it Unfortunately, both together are insufficient to give us any clear idea of the two problematical sounds, *jihvâmûlîya* and *upadhmânîya*, and there is room for us to suspect them of being, like the long *l*-vowel, an artificial fabrication of the Hindu grammarians As for the *s*, there is no question as to its value Nor ought there to be respecting that of the *sh*, which both the explanations of the phonetists and the phenomena of Sanskrit euphony show to have been that particular sibilant (more nearly resembling our *sh* than *s*, but sufficiently distinct from either) which is uttered with the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate It passes my comprehension how European grammarians should continue to identify

---

44 *ûshmâna ânupûrvyena yathâkramena sparçasthâneshû 'ccâranîyâ bhavanti yathâ jihvâmûlîyah kavargasthâne yah k- çakâraç cavargasthâne*[1] *madhuç*[2] ---- *shakârash tavargasthâne asht-*---- *sakâras tavargasthâne stanâ*---- *upadhmânîyah pavargasthâne yah p- ity ânupûrvyena*[3] *ânupûrvyân*[4] *niyamât pañcasû "shmasû 'kteshu hakâro viçishtah*[5] *tasya vidhim uparishtâd âcashte*

[1] W *cavargiyas*, B *cakâras-* [2] W *manyuç* [3] G M *-vyâ vijñeyâh* [4] G M *-vya* [5] B *-çeshah*, G M *vasishthah*

it with our *sh*, and, yet more, how that absurd distinction of the lingual and palatal sibilants (of which, so far as I know, Wilson was the originator) which defines the former as the same with our *sh* in *shun*, and the latter with our *ss* in *session*, can still be repeated in the latest Sanskrit grammars Absurd I call it, because there is really no difference at all between the pronunciation of *sh* in *shun* and *ss* in *session* If our *sh* be found in the Sanskrit alphabet, it is the palatal sibilant *ç*, not the lingual, *sh* The question of the value of *ç* is connected with and depends upon that of the palatal series of mutes, and upon this I have nothing more to say than I said in the note to Ath Pr i 21

करणमध्यं तु विवृतम् ॥ ४५ ॥

45 But the middle of the producing organ is unclosed.

The "but" (*tu*) of this rule, we are told, is intended to annul (so far) the similarity of organ of the spirants with the mutes This prescription of an unclosure of the middle of the organ is a rather artificial device for saving the credit of the general prescription of actual contact in all the consonants It is nearly equivalent with the rules of the Ath Pr (i 30,31) upon the same subject

कण्ठस्थानौ हकारविसर्जनीयौ ॥ ४६ ॥

46 The throat is place of production of *h* and *visarjanîya*

And, the commentator adds, they have no *karana*, or organ of production As example of *h*, he cites *aharahar havirdhâninâm* (ii 5 6[3]), but leaves *visarjanîya* uninstanced

The other Prâtiçâkhyas give a corresponding definition of the utterance of these two sounds (see note to Ath Pr i 19) It is too indefinite to be of any particular use to us in determining their phonetic value But the two rules which next follow in our treatise are very interesting and instructive

उदयस्वरादिसस्थानो हकार एकेषाम् ॥ ४७ ॥

47 In the opinion of some authorities, *h* has the same position as the beginning of the following vowel

Our commentator first offers the simple paraphrase of this rule

---

45 *teshâm ûshmanâm karanamadhyam tu vivrtam bhavati sparçânâm karanasâmyanivrttiparas*[1] *tuçabdah karanânâm madhyam karanamadhyam*

[1] B *-ttyartham*

46 *hakâravisarjanîyâu kanthasthânâu syâtâm kantha sthânam yayos tâu tathoktâu anayoh karanâbhâvah ah-....*

which he finds given by one of his three chief authorities, Vararuci, and then proceeds to exhibit his own superior acuteness by a very long, but not very important, discussion of it a loose version is as follows

The expression "the same position as the beginning," etc, implies a difference of position in the remainder of the vowel, but there is none such in *a*, *i*, *u*, as a vowel has but a single position, the word "beginning" is superfluous, and the desired result would be secured by saying simply "of the same position with the vowel" That is not so a difference of position does in fact belong to the remainder of the diphthongs the two rules (ii 28, 29) which teach that *i* and *u* form the final elements of *âi* and *âu* assure the difference of position for those two sounds, in like manner, a difference of position is to be remarked as prescribed in general grammar [though not in this treatise] for the final elements of *e* and *o*, they being included in the category of diphthongs But again even granting that, the utterance in the throat of this very *a* which makes the initial element of the diphthongs is taught by the rule, "the throat is the place of production of *a*, the *k*-mutes, *h*, and *visarjanîya*," hence, as sameness of position [with the *a*, as throat-sound] is prescribed by the preceding rule, this rule is open to the charge of superfluous repetition You must not think so, is the reply, there is a difference between the *a* which forms the beginning of *e* and *o* and an *a* standing by itself to the latter belongs the description given above in rule 12, "the lips and jaws not too widely separated," etc , to the other, that of rule 27, "with the organ of production more closed," therefore, as place and organ correspond to one another, the expression "of the same position as the beginning" is to be understood as meaning "of the same place and organ as the beginning" Moreover, in the former rule the absence of an organ of production was taught, but here is implied also the presence of such, hence a difference of opinions comes to light, and not merely a superfluous repetition

---

47 *ekeshâm mate hakâra*[1] *udayasvarâdisasthâna âtmana upari svarâdisasthâno*[2] *bhavatî 'ti vâraruci coktam*[3] *syâd etat âdinâ*[4] *sasthâna ity ukte çeshasya sthânântaratvam*[5] *vaktavyam tad apy akârekârokâreshu nâ 'sti* [6] *svarasyâi*[7]*'kam eva* [8]*sthânam*[7] *ity âdiçabdavâiyarthyam syât svarasasthâna*[9] *ity etâvatâi 'vâ 'rthasiddhir*[10] *iti mâi 'vam sandhyakshareshu çeshasya*[8] *sthânântaropapatteh ikâro 'dhyardhah* (ii 28) *iti sûtradvayena çeshabhûtavarnavyaktâu*[11] *tayo*[12] *sthânântaram api prasiddham eva evam*[13] *ekârâukârayor api vyâkarane*[14] *çeshasya sthânântaram vihitam vijñeyam sandhyaksharatvâviçeshâd anayoh nanv evam apy akuhavisarjanîyânâm kantha iti sandhyaksharâdâv akârasyâ 'pi kanthasthânatvât tena samânasthânatve*[15] *kathyamâne*[16] *pûrvasûtroktena*[17] *pâunaruktyam asya*[18] *sûtrasya*

Any detailed criticism of this cunning argument would certainly be open to the charge of superfluity, and I shall not attempt it

A few further examples of the occurrence of *h*, before the various diphthongs, are added *tigmahete* (i 2 14[2]), *yâvatîr vâsâmahâi* (vii 5 2[1]), *agnihotram juhoti* (i 5 9[1]), *samprayatîr ahâu* (v 6 1[2])

The acuteness of observation of the "some authorities" who have made this definition of the character of a *h* certainly deserves respectful, if not admiring, acknowledgment It is the peculiarity of the aspiration, that it is an emission of unintonated breath through the same position of the mouth-organs by which the following intonated sound receives its character thus, the *h* of *ha* is a surd *a*, so to speak, that of *he*, a surd *e*, that of *who*, a surd *u*, that of *hue*, a surd *y*, and so on (see Journ Am Or Soc'y, viii 370 seq) The rule would have been made better by reading *udayavarna*, instead of *udayasvarâdi*—'the following sound,' instead of 'the beginning of the following vowel'—for the assimilation is not less true of the semi-vowels and nasals than of the vowels

पूर्वान्तसस्थानो विसर्जनीयः ॥४८॥

48 *Visarjanîya* has the same position as the end of the preceding vowel

The commentator does not tell us whether this definition is to be looked upon as, like the preceding, expressing the opinion of "some authorities," or as having the unqualified approval of the Prâtiçâkhya From his silence we should infer the latter, but the connection gives reason for presuming the former He paraphrases "*visarjanîya* is of like position—that is, of like place and organ—with the end of the vowel that precedes itself," and adds that

---

syât mâi 'vam mansthâh ekârâukârâdivartino[19] *'kârasya kevalasya ca viçesho 'sti kevalasya* [20] *karanam oshthahanu nâ 'tivyastam* (ii 12) *iti*[21] *sandhyaksharâdâu vartamânasya tu samvrtakaranataram* (ii 27) *tasmât sthânakaranayoh sahacaritatvâd*[22] *âdisasthâna ity ukta âdisamânasthânakarana*[23] *iti vijñeyam kim ca pûrvasûtre karanâbhâva ity*[24] *uktah atra tu karanavattvam api*[25] *vidyata iti matântaram upapadyate na pâunaruktyam ca tathâ*[26] *tig- yâv-.... agn-.... sam-.... udayaçabda uttaraparyâyah*[27] *udayaç câ 'sâu*[28] *svaraç ca* [29] *tasyâ "dih tena sasthânah*

[1] G M put before *ekeshâm* [2] G M *udayasvar-* [3] W B *var-* [4] W *âdi* [5] G M *taram* [6] G M ins *tathâ sati* [(7)] W *'kasthânam evam* [(8)] B om [9] G M *svarasya sa-* [10] G M om *artha*, G M *-ddher* [11] G M *-bhutam v-* [12] G M *tasyâ* [13] G M om [14] G M *-na* [15] G M *sthâ-* [16] G M *kalpy* [17] G M *-vok-* [18] G M *eva tasya* [19] G M *-rayor âdi* [20] W ins *tu* [21] G M *nâ 'tyupasamhrtam ca*, B *no 'pasamhrtam* [22] W B *-ritvâd* [23] W *-sthana* [24] G M om [25] G M om [26] G M om [27] G M *udayasvarâdisasthânah* [28] G M om. *asâu* [29] G M ins *udayasvàrah*

here too the language of the rule is aimed at the diphthongs, since no other vowel exhibits any difference of position between its end and its beginning His examples, again, are only of *visarjanîya* after a diphthong they are *agneh* (i.1 10³ et al), *brâhmanâir âyushmat* (ii 3 10³), *bâhuvor balam* (v 5 9²), and *â 'yam gâuh* (i 5 3¹) In the second and third of these passages, only the first word should have been quoted, in order to exhibit the *visarjanîya*

The teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas respecting the *visarjanîya* are rehearsed in the note to Ath Pr i 19 All are so indefinite as really to teach us nothing respecting the phonetic value of the sound The present rule alone gives us positive and precise information, teaching us to regard it as, like the *h*, a simple uncharacterized breathing, a kind of final *h*

नासिक्या नासिकास्थानाः ॥ ४९ ॥

49 The nose-sounds have the nose as their place of production

The "nose-sounds," the commentary says, are the *yamas* (xxi 12,13), but why the *nâsikya* (xxi 14) should not be regarded as included among them I do not see Any discussion of their phonetic character may be best deferred until the chapter where the rules for their occurrence are given As examples of the nose-sounds are quoted *rukmam antaram* (v 1 10³ but G M B give instead *rukmantam*, ii 2 3³), *yâcñâ* (i 5 7⁴ but G M give instead *râjñâ*, ii 6 2² et al), *âtnârah* (v 6 5³), *ratnam abhajanta* (ii 6 12¹ but G M give instead, if it be not merely a corrupted reading, *uccâ ratnam ayajanta*, which I have not found in the Sanhitâ), and *pâpmânam* (i 4 41 et al)

मुखनासिक्या वा ॥ ५० ॥

50 Or they are produced by the mouth and nose

Respecting this alternative explanation nothing need be said at present

---

48 *visarjanîya âtmanah pûrvasvarântena sasthânah samânasthânakarano bhavati atrâ 'pi pûrvasvara iti sandhyaksharam ucyate svarântarasya*[1] *hi*[2] *sthânântaratvâbhâvât yathâ ag-*[3] *brâh-.... bâh-....*[4] *â.... pûrvasyâ 'ntah tena sasthânah pûrvântasasthânah*[5]

[1] W B *ntasya* [2] B om, G M *bhinna* [3] B om [4] B om [5] B om

49 *nâsikyâ yamâ nâsikâsthânâ bhavanti yathâ· ruk-.... yâ- ât- rat-.... pâp-*

50 *ta*[1] *eva nâsikyâ mukhanâsikâbhyâm*[2] *uccâryamânâ bhavanti mukham ca nâsikâ*[3] *ca mukhanâsike*[4] *tatsambandhino mukhanâsikyâh* [5]*uktâny evo 'dâharanâni*[5]

[1] G M *eta* [2] G M *mukhena nâsikabhyâm ca* [3] G M *ke* [4] G M *-kam* (5) G M put after *bhavanti*

वर्गवच्चैषु ॥५१॥

51. And, in them, the organ of production is as in the series of mutes.

The "and" (*ca*) of this rule, the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look' (a distant glance backward: the phrase is used several times later in like cases), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series.

If the mouth be regarded as bearing a part in the production of the nose-sounds or *yamas*, in a way which is determined by the mode of formation of the mutes to which they are attached, it is difficult to see how their number can be restricted to four, as it is in the "list of sounds" given at the beginning of the treatise, and in the comment on rule xxi. 12.

नासिकाविवरणादानुनासिक्यं नासिकाविवरणादानुनासिक्यम् ॥५२॥

52. Nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nose.

Ânunâsikya is the quality of being *anunâsika* or 'nasal,' and this name, as prescribed by rule 30, above, and fully supported by the usage of the treatise elsewhere, belongs to *anusvâra* and the various nasal consonants. The definition of the manner in which the quality is communicated is quite unexceptionable, the organs of the mouth remaining in the positions already given for the various classes and single sounds, the opening of the nasal passage, and the utterance through it of a part or the whole of the emitted material, makes the corresponding nasal sound.

The commentator explains *nâsikâvivarana* by *ghrânabila*, 'hole of the nose, nasal passage,' as if *vivarana* signified the opening or cavity, instead of the act of opening or unclosing. His choice of an example also seems to betray a want of appreciation of the true scope of the rule: it is *suçlokâ3n̐ sumañgalâ3n̐* (i. 8. 16[2]).

---

51. *siṅhâvalokanena*[1] *vargasyo 'ktam karanam cakâro 'nukarshati eshu*[2] *nâsikyeshu vargavat karanam bhavati vargasye 'va vargavat.*

[1] G. M. *kananyâyena*. [2] G. M. (as also in the text of the rule itself) *eteshu*.

52. *nâsikâvivaranâd ghrânabilâd*[1] *ânunâsikyam rañgâdi kartavyam yathâ*[2] *suç- - - - ity âdi.*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane dvitîyo 'dhyâyah.

[1] G. M. *nâsikâb-*. [2] B. *tathâ*; W. om.

CHAPTER III

CONTENTS 1, introductory, 2–6, cases of *â* at the end of the first member of a compound, requiring to be shortened in divided text, 7, of *i* and *u*, 8–12, of final *a* of verbal forms and particles, 13–14, of final *i* and *u*, 15, of initial *a*

अथादावुत्तरे विभागे ह्रस्वं व्यञ्जनपरः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now then—at the beginning or end of a word, a vowel, in case of separation, if followed by a consonant, becomes short as hereinafter set forth

Matters of introductory explanation, of interpretation of the rules of the treatise, and of phonetic theory, being now for the present disposed of (for they are resumed, in a supplementary way, in some of the concluding chapters), the task of determining the readings of the Sanhitâ is taken up And the first subject dealt with is that of the irregular prolongations of vowels—chiefly final *a*, *i*, and *u*—which are so frequent in all the Vedic texts In the other treatises (Rik Pr vii–ix, Vâj Pr iii 95–128, Ath Pr iii.1–25), the rules tell us in what situations a vowel originally short is lengthened this is more in accordance with the general method of the Prâtiçâkhyas, which take for granted, upon the whole, the existence of their *çâkhâs* in the analyzed condition of the *pada*-text, and proceed to construct the *samhitâ* from it Here, on the contrary, we are told what vowels, long in the ordinary text, are to be shortened when thrown out of combination with their surroundings Such dissolution of the continuity of the text takes place, first, in *pada*, whenever a pause—either the *avagraha* separating the two members of a compound, in its repetition after *iti*, or the longer pause that divides between two words—comes to stand between the vowel in question and the consonant which was its next neighbor in *samhitâ* thus, *devâyata iti deva-yate*, *ava nah* (s *avâ nah*) Second, it is made in the so-called *jatâ*-text, examples of which are often quoted in the sequel, and to which the rules of the treatise are in more than one instance adapted, this text is constructed by thrice repeating each pair of words—first in

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah âdâu padâdâv uttare padânte ca vartamânah samhitâyâm yo dîrgho 'sâu vibhâge vibhâgasamaye vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate* [1] *vyañjanaparatvam*[2] *atra yathâsamhitâstham vijñeyam nanu dîrghah katham labhyate* [3]*hrasvânantarabhâvitvâd devâçîkâ* (iii.2) "*dîgrahaneshu plutâdarçanâc ce*[4] *'ti brûmah samhitâyâm ity asyâ 'yam arthah*[3] *kâryabhâjah padasyo 'ttarapadena saha sambandhaniyamah*[5] [6]*na tu pûrvapadena saha sambandhaniyamah*[6] *vibhâgo 'tra*

their natural order, then inverted, then in the natural order again for example, *âpo hi shthâ mayobhuvah* would become *âpo hi hy âpa âpo hi hi shtha stha hi hi shtha sthâ mayobhuvo mayobhuva stha sthâ mayobhuvah mayobhuva iti mayah-bhuvah* the treatment of the *â* of *sthâ* here illustrates the conditions of the restoration of the short vowel in such cases Third, the same restoration takes place in the *samhitâ*-text of the existing manuscripts and in the edition founded upon them, when the lengthened vowel happens to come at the end of one of those passages, of just fifty words each, into which the *anuvâkas* or sections of the Sanhitâ are divided This division the Prâtiçâkhya does not recognize—or, at any rate, does not notice—not infrequently quoting in *sandhi*, without remark, words which are separated by it (for example, under rule 13, below, *uçmasî gamadhye*, i 3 6 1-2, where the edited text reads correctly *uçmasi 1 gamadhye*)

The comment upon this rule may be loosely translated, or paraphrased, as follows

Here *atha*, 'now then,' is an introductory heading, *âdâu* [literally, 'at the beginning'] means 'at the beginning of a word' [including, also, a separable part of a compound word], *uttare* [literally, 'in the latter part') means 'at the end of a word ' a vowel occupying such a position, if it be long in *samhitâ*, becomes short *vibhâge*, i e 'in case of separation,' when followed by a consonant—that is to say, when so followed in *samhitâ* But whence is derived the limitation to a "long" vowel? We answer, from its conversion into a short, and from the non-occurrence of any protracted (*pluta*) vowels among the instances included in the rules The limitation "in *samhitâ*" implies that the word whose form is in question is placed in euphonic connection with the word that follows it, not, however, with the word that precedes it [unless, as should be excepted, its initial vowel, instead of its final, is the one liable to change of quantity] "Separation" (*vibhâga*) is to be understood as division from the words with which it stands in natural or original connection—that is, according to the reading of the fundamental text otherwise, in the *jatâ*-text of the two words *sthâ mayobhuvah* (see above), the *stha* would retain its long *â* in its second repetition, because of its standing in euphonic connection with the following word and that should not be so The sense of the word *vibhâga* is, in case of a long initial vowel, separation from the preceding word, in case of a long final, from the

---

prakrtipadâir ucyate prakrtir nâma yathâpâthah prakrtipadâir iti kim sthâ m- ity atra jatâyâm sthaçabdasya dvitîyoccârane 'pi dîrghah prasajyeta[7] *uttarapadena vibhâgâbhâvât sa*[8] *mâ bhûd iti parihârah vibhâgapadasyâ*[9] *'yam arthah padâdâu*[10] *dîrghasya pûrvapadena vibhâgah padânte*[11] *dîrghasyo 'ttarapadena vibhâgah vibhâge vyañjanapara iti kim rt-.... ity atra mâ bhûd iti nâdhâmâdhârayâ* (III.8) *iti prâptih samhitâyâm*[12] *dîrgha iti kim. esha.... ity atra prâptisampâdanârtham*

following word The limitation "in case of separation, if followed by a consonant" is for the sake of excluding such cases as *rtadhâmâ 'si* (i 3 3 in separated form, *rtadhâmâ asi*), which would otherwise come under the rule iii 8 [among the specifications of which, *dhâmâ* is included] The limitation "a long vowel in *samhitâ*" is intended to bring *esha vo bharatâ râjâ* (i 8 10² et al, *pada*-text, *bharatâh*) under the action of the rules, since thus, and not otherwise, is pertinence given to the word *yâjyâ* in rule 11 of this chapter Undue extension of the prescription to such cases as *tvâ vâyavah* (i 1 1) is provided against by the rules that follow [since these specify all the cases in which it is to be applied]

The only difficulty arising in connection with the understanding of this rule, or of the interpretation of it given by the commentator, grows out of the specification *vyañjanapara*, 'followed by a consonant' Respecting this, we are explicitly told, near the beginning of the exposition, "the being followed by a consonant is to be understood here of the condition of things in the *samhitâ*-text"—that is to say, any long vowel which appears in *samhitâ* as a final, with a consonant following it, is to be regarded as falling under the rules of the chapter This specification, then, makes the rules apply to such cases as *bharatâ râjâ* (the example quoted by the commentator the *pada*-reading is *bharatâh râjâ*) and *adhâ mâ* (quoted under rule 9, *pada*-reading *adhâh mâ*), and they have to be specially allowed for and excepted—as is done in rules 9 and 11 It seems very strange, now, to have this implication made, requiring as a consequence that all the words which by euphonic processes come to exhibit in *samhitâ* a long final vowel (*â*) should be taken into consideration but the number of cases actually needing to be guarded against in the rules on account of it is very small For, in the first place, the question can arise only in regard to the words specially mentioned in the rules, and among these there are not many for which homophonous forms in *âh* or *âi* occur, and of these, again, only a part would occur otherwise than before a vowel, in which situation the hiatus would betray the omission of the former final element The makers of the treatise, then, appear to have thought it safer to avoid a possible confusion of *adhâ* from *adhâh* with *adhâ* from *adha*, and so on, by making the rules apply in general to both cases, and specially excepting the former And this is what they have attempted to do and it has cost them only two additional words—*agniyâjye* in rule 9, and *yâjyâsu* in rule 11—together with an artifice of

---

tathâ sati bharatâ yâjyâsv (iii 11) *iti yâjyâpadam sârthakam nâ 'nyathâ vyañjanam asmât param*[13] *iti vyañjanaparah tvâ—— ity âdâv etallakshanasambhavâd*[14] *ativyâptim*[15] *uttarasûtrâih pariharati*

[1] G M ins *padâdau ca padante ca yo dirgho vyañjanottaro vibhâge kriyamâne hrasvam samyâti* [2] G M *-nam* [(3)] M om, G *hrasvânt* [4] G om *ca* [5] G M *-dhah* [(6)] W om [7] G M *yate* [8] G M om [9] G M *gaçabd* [10] W *dadi* [11] W *nta* [12] G M ins *yo* [13] G M *ra* [14] G M *eva tal* [15] W *atipra*

construction under rule 8, in connection with the word *pr ânâh* Without a complete *index verborum* to the Sanhitâ, or a laboriously minute examination of the whole text with reference to this particular point, I cannot tell just how nearly successful their attempt has been, but I have, I believe, discovered at least one case which they have overlooked At i 4 24, namely, we read *rakshâ mâkih* (p *rakshâh*), and, by rule 8, the *â* of *rakshâ* should be shortened That the section containing these words was really a part of the text for which the Prâtiçâkhya was constructed is proved by the fact that two of its peculiarities of reading are provided for in later rules (vi 5 and xi 13)

But with the interpretation thus given appears to be quite at variance the phrase containing the illustration *rtadhâmâ 'si*, where *vibhâge* and *vyañjanaparah* are immediately connected, and made to mean 'followed by a consonant in separated text' (not *rtadhâmâ asi*) This I can hardly believe to be a genuine part of the commentary The second *â* of *rtadhâmâ 'si* cannot be said to be either final or initial it is a combination of both it does not furnish a case to which the rules of the chapter apply with any propriety, as the *samhitâ* reading cannot be affected by them If not some later meddler, then the commentator himself, has suffered himself to be scared by an imaginary difficulty, and has unnecessarily twisted the rule a little awry in order to its removal

The specification *vibhâge*, 'in case of separation,' applies in the Tâittirîya *pada*-text more generally and more strictly than in those of the other Vedas Where the separation of a compound is suspended on account of its further composition, the restoration of its natural form is suspended also and we read, for example, *vîrya-vat*, but *vîryâvat-tara*, *viçva-mitra*, but *viçvâmitra-jamadagnî*, *anu-yâja* and *ananu-yâja*, but *prayâja-anûyâja*, and so on—and we shall find illustrations hereafter in connection with other changes than prolongation of vowels Thus, also, in the full *pada* readings, the word is given first, before *iti*, in its *samhitâ* form, without change (except euphonic combination with the *iti*), and this part of the reading I shall accordingly usually omit in quoting the *pada*-text, setting down only the separated and restored form which follows *iti*, or the part which corresponds to the entire reading of the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts

देवाशीकासुम्नाश्वर्तावयुनाहृदयाघोक्थाप्सुद्दा ॥ २ ॥

2 *Devâ, çîkâ, sumnâ, çvâ, rtâ, vayunâ, hrdayâ, aghâ,*

---

2 ------ *ity eteshu grahaneshv avagraheshv*[1] *antyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ dev----- çîk----- sumn----- dyâv-----* [2]*apy akarâdi* (i 52) *iti vacanâd*[3] *idam apy udâharanam*[4] *açv----- rt---- vay-----*[2] *hrd-----, agh----- ukth----- âpo----*

[1] G M om [(2)] B om [3] G M *sutrâd* [4] G M *-hartavyam*

ukthâ, and *çuddhâ*, as first members of a compound, shorten their final when separated

This and the following rules, including the seventh, properly form one connected passage, with the specification *ity avagrahah*, 'these, as former members of a compound,' which applies alike to them all, standing at the end

The examples quoted from the Sanhitâ in illustration of the rule are as follows For *devâ devâyate yajamânâya çarma* (iii 5 5[3] G M omit the last word of the citation), the only case, so far as I have noted, for *devâyant*, we have *devayate* (with short vowel) twice, at i 2 12[3] and ii 5.9[3] *devâyuvam* occurs ii 5 9[6] and iv 1 1[3], but *devayuh*, iii.5 11[1] For *çîkâ*, *çîkâyate svâhâ* (vii 5 11[2]), the only case For *sumnâ*, *sumnâyanto havâmahe* (i 5 11[4]), also alone For *çvâ*, *dyâvâprthivyâ çvâvit* (v 5 20) *çvâ*, however, by rule i 52, includes *açvâ*, for which is quoted *açvâvatîm somavatîm* (iv 2 6[4]), I have noted farther only iii 3 11[1], but feel less than usual confidence in the completeness of my exception For *rtâ*, *rtâyavah purâ 'nnam akshan* (ii 2 5[5] G M omit the last word of the citation) there are more than twenty such cases in the text, for the themes *rtâyu* (e g i 4 5 but *rtayu* once, ii 2 12[4]), *rtâyant* (e g iv 2 9[3]), *rtâvan* (e g i 3 14[2]) and its feminine *rtâvarî* (e g i 1 3), *rtâvrdh* (e g i 4 5), and *rtâsah* (iii 4 7[1] but this word reads in *pada* as in *samhitâ*) For *vayunâ*, *vayunâvid eka it* (i 2 13[1] and iv 1 1[1]) For *hrdayâ*, *hrdayâvidhaç cit* (i 4 45[1]) For *aghâ*, *aghâyavo mâ gandharvo viçvâvasur âdadhat* (i 2 9 G M omit after *gandharvah*) other cases of *aghâyu* are found at iii 3 11[1] iv 1 10[3], 5 10[4] v 7 3[1], and of *aghâyant*, ii 3 14[1] For *ukthâ*, *ukthâmadânâm dhenuh* (ii 4 11[6]) the same compound occurs again at iii 3 2[1] and v 6 8[6], and *ukthâyu* at i 4 12, twice For *çuddhâ*, *âpo devîh çuddhâyuvah* (i 3 8[2] and vi 3 8[4])

इन्द्रा वद्वन्वान्परः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Also *indrâ*, when followed by *vat*, *van* and *vân*

One example is quoted by the commentator for each of the three cases enumerated *indrâvatîm apacitîm ihâ "vaha* (v 7 4[3] G M omit after *apacitîm*), *indrâvanto marutah* (iv 7 14[1]), and *indrâvânt svâhâ* (i 1 12), and I have noted no others As counter-examples, he quotes first, to show that not every long *â* is to be shortened before the three syllables named, *ûrnâvantam prathamah sîda yonim* (iii 5 11[1] G M give only the first two words), *asura prajâvân* (iii 1 11[1] but B reads, I presume only by an

---

3 *indre 'ty asminn*[1] *avagrahe 'ntyasvaro vad van vân ity evamparo vibhâge hrasvam âpadyate yathâ*[2] *ind-.... ind-.... ind-.... indre 'ti kim ûrn-.... as .... praj-.... evampara iti kim ind-....*

[1] G M *etasminn* [2] G M om

error, *pratâpavân*), and *prajâvatîr anamîvâ ayakshmâh* (i. 1 1 but omitted in G M), second, to show that *indrâ* is not altered except under the circumstances specified, *indrâvarunayor aham* (ii 5 12[2]). This last is a case in which no *vibhâga*, or 'separation,' would be made in any text of the other Vedas, but the Tâittirîya *pada* reads *indrâvarunayor iti 'ndrâ-varunayoh*, and the example is therefore to the purpose

चित्रा वपरः ॥४॥

4 Also *citrâ*, when followed by *v*

The illustrative passage cited is *citrâvaso svasti te pâram açîya* (i 5 5[4] and 7[5] G M omit after *te*) As counter-examples, are given *mitrâvarunâv eva* (ii 1 7[3] et al p *mitrâ-varunâu*), and *citrâpûrnamâse dîksheran* (vii 4 8[2])—the former to show the necessity of the restriction to *citrâ*, the latter, of the restriction to sequence by a *v* I have found no farther instances falling under the rule

प्रस्थेन्द्रियाद्रविणाविश्वदेव्यादीर्घावीर्याविश्वावातात्वा-भङ्गुराकर्णकावृष्णियासुगोपर्क्षामाघासत्रावर्षापुष्पामे-घाप्रास्वा ॥५॥

5 Also *prasthâ*, *indriyâ*, *dravinâ*, *viçvadevyâ*, *dîrghâ*, *vîryâ*, *viçvâ*, *vâtâ*, *tvâ*, *bhañgurâ*, *karnakâ*, *vrshniyâ*, *sugopâ*, *rksâmâ*, *aghâ*, *satrâ*, *varshâ*, *pushpâ*, *meghâ*, *prâ*, *svâ*

For each of these words, the commentator cites a single example For *prasthâ*, *prasthâvad rathavâhanam* (iv 2 5[6]), the only case For *indriyâ*, *indriyâvate purodâçam* (ii 2 7[1]) half a dozen cases of this word occur in the text, and several of *indriyâvin* (e g i 6 2[4] ii 1 6[3] vi 2 10[6]), the latter word, however, is not separated in the *pada*-text For *dravinâ*, *dravinâvatah kurute* (v 3 11[2]), the only case For *viçvadevyâ*, *viçvadevyâvate çvâtrâh* (i 4 1[1]) the word occurs also at iv 1 6[1,2] For *dîrghâ*, *dîrghâdhiyo rakshamânâh* (ii 1 11[4]), the only case For *vîryâ*, *vîryâvantam abhimâtishâham* (i 2 7) the same theme is found in other passages, as are also its comparative, *vîryâvat-tara* (e g i. 7 6[3]), and superlative, *vîryâvat-tama* (ii 4 2[1]), in which the shortening of the *â* is not authorized by the Prâtiçâkhya, since, in the division, it does not stand next before the pause and the *pada*-text reads accordingly For *viçvâ*, *viçvâmitrasya sûktam bhavati* (v 2 3[3,4] G M omit

---

4 *citrâ ity asminn*[1] *avagrahe 'ntyasvaro vakâraparo*[2] *vibhâge hrasvam âpadyate yathâ*[3] *cit----* *citre 'ti kim* *mitr----* *vapara iti kim* *citr----*

[1] G M *etasminn* [2] G M *vap* [3] G M om

the last word) the same word occurs in other passages (iv 3 2^{2} v 2 3^{3,4}, 10^{5}, 4 2^{2}), as also in the compound *viçvâmitrajamadagnî* (v 4 11^{3}), where, as the division is *viçvâmitra-jamadagnî*, the *â* is not shortened, and we have further the themes *viçvâvasu* (e g i 1 11^{1}), *viçvâvant* (iii 5 6^{2}), *viçvârâj* (i 3 2^{1}), and *viçvâsah* (i 4 17, p *viçva-sâham*) For *vâtâ*, *vâtâvad varshan* (ii 4 7^{1}), the only case For *tvâ*, *tvâvato maghonah* (ii 2 12^{8}, p *tva-vatah*) the Rik *pada*-text does not shorten the *â* of this word For *bhañgurâ*, *bhettâram bhañgurâvatah* (i 5 6^{4} and iv 1 2^{5}) For *karnakâ*, *sûrmî karnakâvaty etayâ* (i 5 7^{6} and v 4 7^{3} G M omit the first word, W B the last) For *vrshniyâ*, *vrshniyâvatas tava* (iii 5 6^{2} ^{3}) For *sugopâ*, *sa sugopâtamo janah* (iv 2 11^{2}, p *sugopa-tamah* G M omit the first word) the Rik *pada* writes *su-gopâtamah* For *rksâmâ*, *rksâmâbhyâm yajushâ* (i 2 3^{3} and iii 1 1^{4}) For *aghâ*, *aghâçvâd evâi 'nam antar eti bhûtam* (iii 1 7^{2}, p *agha-çvât* G M omit the last two words), the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts write *agha-açva* the themes *aghâyu* (e g i 2 9^{1}) and *aghâyant* (ii 3 14^{1}) are also found in the Sanhitâ For *satrâ*, *satrâjitam dhanajitam* (iv 1 1^{3}, p *satra-jitam*) the word *satrâ* occurs repeatedly (e g i 6 12^{1}) uncompounded, and maintains its long final in the *pada*-text also For *varshâ*, *varshâhvâm juhoti* (ii 4 10^{3}, p *varsha-hvâm*) For *pushpâ*, *pushpâvatîh supippalâh* (iv 1 4^{4} and v 1 5^{10}) For *meghâ*, *meghâyate svâhâ* (vii 5 11^{1}, p *megha-yate*, in the same division occurs also *meghâyishyate*, which is not divided *meghayantî* is found at iv 4 5^{1}) For *prâ*, *prâvanebhih sajoshasah* (iv 2 4^{3}, p *pra-vanebhih*), the Rik *pada*-text writes this word *pravana*, without separation other words beginning with *prâ* are *prâsah* (e g i 3 14^{6}, p *pra-sahâ*), *prâçrñga* (ii 1 3^{4} ^{5}), *prâsaca* (vii.5 11^{1}, not divided in *pada*-text), *prâkâça* (i 8 18, also not divided), and *prâvrta* (iv 6 2^{2} et al, also not divided) And for *svâ*, *svâdhiyam janayat sûdayac ca* (i 3 14^{6}, p *sva dhiyam*) but this the Rik *pada*-text writes *su-âdhyam*

लोकएवेष्टा ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also *ishtâ*, after *loke* and *eva*

The commentator cites the two cases *sam amushmin loka ishtâpûrtena* (iii 3 8^{5} twice G M omit the first word), and *sa tv eve 'shtâpûrtî* (i 7 3^{3}, p *ishta-pûrtî*) Then, to show that *ishtâ* after other words remains unchanged, he quotes *prati jâgrhy enam ishtâpûrte san srjethâm ayam ca* (iv 7 13^{5}, p *ishtâ-pûrte* W B

---

5 ------ *ity eteshv avagraheshv antyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate* *yathâ* *pras-----* *indr-----* *drav-----* *viçv-----* *dîr-----* *vîr-----* *viçv-----* *vât-----* *tvâ-----* *bhett-----* *sûr-----* *vrsh-----* *sa-----* *rks-----* *agh-----* *satr-----* *varsh-----* *pushp-----* *megh-----* *prâv-----* *svâ-----*

omit before *enam*, G M after *-pûrte*), and the same mode of treatment is followed by the *pada*-text at v 7 7², which is the only other case I have noted The ground of this difference does not appear To show, further, that only *ishtâ* shortens its *â* in the defined position, the passage *sâkshâd eva prajâpataye* (v 1 2⁵) is given

शक्तीरथीत्विषीवाशीरात्र्योषध्याहुतीव्याहृतीस्वाहा-
कृतीह्रादुनीशचीचितीश्रोणीपृष्टीपूत्यभीचर्षणीपर्यधीपा-
रीशत्रूविषूवसूअनूहनूसूविभू इत्यवग्रहः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Also *çaktî*, *rathî*, *tvishî*, *vâçî*, *râtrî*, *oshadhî*, *âhutî*, *vyâhrtî*, *svâhâkrtî*, *hrâdunî*, *çacî*, *citî*, *cronî*, *prshtî*, *pûtî*, *abhî*, *carshanî*, *parî*, *adhî*, *pârî*, *çatrû*, *vishû*, *vasû*, *anû*, *hanû*, *sû*, *vibhû*—all these, as first members of a compound

To the passages cited by the commentator I add, as above, notice of other cases which I have found in the text For *çaktî*, the sole instance is *çaktîvanto gabhîrâh* (iv 6 6³) For *rathî*, *rathîtamâu rathînâm* (iv 7 15³) For *tvishî*, *saspiñjarâya tvishîmate pathînâm* (iv 5 2¹ W B omit the last word, G M the first) For *vâçî*, *te vâçîmanta ishminah* (ii 1 11² and iv 2 11² G M omit the last word) For *râtrî*, *râtrîbhir asubhnan* (ii 4 1¹) if there are other cases, I have failed to note them For *oshadhî*, *oshadhîbhyo vehatam âlabheta* (ii 1 5³ G M omit the last word) I have noted half a dozen other cases, but they are not worth reporting For *âhutî*, *âhutîbhir anûyâjeshu* (ii 6 9⁴) For *vyâhrtî*, *etâbhir vyâhrtîbhih* (i 6 10² and v 5 5³) For *svâhâkrtî*, *svâhâkrtîbhyah preshye 'ty âha* (vi 3 9⁵ G M omit the last two words) For *hrâdunî*, *svâhâ hrâdunîbhyah svâhâ* (vii 4 13 G M omit the first word, W B the last) For *çacî*, *viçvâ rûpâ 'bhi cashte çacîbhih* (iv 2 5⁴ ⁵ W B omit before *cashte*) For *citî*, *citîbhyâm upâyan* (v 7 5⁷) For *çronî*, *çronîbhyâñ svâhâ* (vii 3 16²) another case is found at v 7 15 For *prshtî*, W B give *prshtîbhir divam* (v 7 17), but G M read *prshtîbhyah svâhâ* (vii 3 16¹) For *pûtî*, *pûtîgandhasyâ 'pahatyâi* (ii 2 2⁴) For *abhî*, *abhîvrto ghrnîvân cetati tmanâ* (iii 5 11¹ G M omit the last two words) we have also *abhîshah* at ii 3 2⁶ (p *abhi-sahâ*) For *carshanî*, *mitrasya carshanîdhrtah* (iii 4 11⁵ and iv 1 6³) another case at i 4 16 For *parî*, *vîravantam parînasam* (ii 2 12⁶, p *pari-nasam* compare rule vii 4) For *adhî*, *adhîvâsam yâ hiranyâny asmâi* (iv 6 9² G M omit the last word) For *pârî*, *pârînahyasye* "*çe* (vi 2 1¹, p *pâri-nahyasya* compare rule vii 4) For *çatrû*, *ça-*

6 *loke eva îty evampûrva ishte 'ty asmin*[1] *grahane*[2] *'ntyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ sam.... sa.... evampûrva iti kim prati.... ishte 'ti kim sâk-....*

[1] G M *etasminn* [2] G M *avagrahe*

trâyato hantâ (i 6 5³ and iv 2 1²) For *vishû*, *vishûvân vishûvantah* (vii.4 3⁴) another case at vii 4 8² For *vasû*, *aramatir vasûyuh* (iv 3 13⁶) For *anû*, *anûrâdhâ nakshatram* (iv 4 10²), we have it also in the compounds *anûyâja* (e g ii 6 9⁴), *anûbandhya* (e g ii 2 9⁷), *anûkâça* (e g v 4 1³), and *anûvrj* (v 7 23) In the further compound of the first, *prayâjânûyâja* (e g i 7 1¹, p *prayâja-anûyâjân*), the shortening is not authorized, since in it there is no division after *anu* Appealing to rule i 53 as his authority, the commentator adds, as contemplated by the present rule, *ananûyâjam prâyanîyam* (vi 1 5³, p *ananu-yâjam*) For *hanû*, *hanûbhyâṅ svâhâ* (vii 3 16¹) For *sû*, *sûyavasinî manave yaçasye* (i 2 13²) *sûyavasa* occurs more than once (e g i 7 5²,³) For *vibhû*, *vibhûdâvne* (iii 5 8,9²)

The commentator notes that the specification at the end of this rule defines the whole mass of words thus far enumerated as collectively *avagraha* (i 49), 'first members of compounds'

अवासचस्वानुदामृडावर्धाशिक्षारक्षाद्याभवाभजायत्रा-
चरापिबानाधामाधारयाधर्षाघावर्धयाबोधात्रातत्रामुञ्चाश्व-
स्यापृणास्वाहिष्ठात्वंतराजनिष्वायुक्ष्वाच्छा ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also *avâ*, *sacasvâ*, *nudâ*, *mrdâ*, *vardhâ*, *çikshâ*, *rakshâ*, *adyâ*, *bhavâ*, *bhajâ*, *yatrâ*, *carâ*, *pibâ*, *nâ*, *dhâmâ*, *dhârayâ*, *dharshâ*, *ghâ*, *vardhayâ*, *bodhâ*, *atrâ*, *tatrâ*, *muñcâ*, *açvasyâ*, *prnasvâ*, *hi shthâ*, *tvam tarâ*, *janishvâ*, *yukshvâ*, *achâ*

Henceforth we have to do only with independent words, the category of *avagrahas*, or former members of compounds, having been exhausted by the foregoing rules There is cited in illustration, for *avâ*, *avâ no devyâ krpâ* (iv 1 4¹) For *sacasvâ*, *sacasvâ nah svastaye* (i 5 6²) For *nudâ*, *pra nudâ nah sapatnân* (iv 3 12¹ thrice, and v 3 5¹) For *mrdâ*, W B give *mrdâ jaritre* (iv 5 10⁴), but G M read *mrdâ no rudra* (iv 5 10²) I have noted no other case For *vardhâ*, *vardhâ no amavac chavah* (ii 6 11³) For *çik-*

7 ...... *ity eteshv avagraheshv*[1] *antyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ çak-.... rath-.... sa-.... te.... râ-.... osh-.... âh-.... et-.... svâ-.... svâhâ.... viç-.... cit-.... çro-.... prsh-.... pût-.... abh-.... mitr-.... vîr-.... adh-.... pâr-.... çatr-.... vish-.... ar-...., anû-.... ankârâdi ca*[2] (i 53) *iti vacanâd*[3] *anan-.... ity etad*[4] *udâharanam bhavati han-.... sûy-.... vibh-.... ity avagraha ity anena prakâreno 'ktih*[5] *padasamudâye*[6] *'vagraho vijñeyah*[7]

[1] G M om [2] G M om [3] G M *sûtrât* [4] G M ins *apy* [5] G M *'ktah* [6] G M *-muccayah* [7] B *viçeshah*

shâ, çikshâ no asmin puruhûta yâmani (VII 5 7[4] W B omit the last two words) it is found again at IV 6 2[5] For *rakshâ, rakshâ ca no adhi ca deva brûhi* (IV 5 10[3] and VII 5 24, G M omit the last two words) the form occurs also at II 3 14[1] I have pointed out in the note to the first rule of the chapter that a passage (I 4 24) in which *rakshâ* appears as euphonic alteration of *rakshâh* before a sonant consonant ought to be somehow excepted here For *adyâ, adyâ devân jushtatamah* (IV 6 7[5]) also at II 1 11[6] III 4 11[2] IV 6 2[6] For *bhavâ, bhavâ pâyur viço asyâ adabdhah* (I.2 14[1] G M omit the last two words) other cases are not infrequent, see I 1 14[4], 4 32 III.2 5[3], 4 10[1] IV 1 7[2], 2 5[1],7[4], 4 4[7], and likewise II 6 12[1], where *bhavâ*, standing at the end of the first division of the *anuvâka*, is situated *vibhâge*, and loses its *â* even in the *samhitâ*-text For *bhajâ, â gomati vraje bhajâ tvam nah* (I 6 12[1] W B begin at *vraje*) another case at III.3 9[2] For *yatrâ, yatrâ naro marutah* (III 1 11[8]) other cases at IV 4 4[1], 6 6[4],7[2] For *carâ, pra carâ soma duryân* (I 2 10[1]) For *pibâ, pibâ somam indra mandatu* (II 4 14[3] G M omit the last word) another case at I.4 19 For *nâ, ripavo nâ ha debhuh* (I 2 14[5 6]) in connection with this word, the commentator runs off into a lengthy discussion, which I defer to the end of the note For *dhâmâ, dhâmâ ha yat te ajara* (III 1 11[6]) we have *dhâma*, plural, in *samhitâ* also, at IV 6 5[5], 7 13[4] For *dhârayâ, brhaspate dhârayâ vasûni* (I 3 7[1] and VI 3 6[1]) other cases at IV 1 5[4],7[2] For *dharshâ*, W B have *dharshâ mânushân adbhyah* (I.3 8[1]), but G M, *dharshâ mânushân iti ni yunakti* (VI 3 6[3]) For *ghâ, uta vâ ghâ syâlât* (I.1 14[1]) there is another case, if my manuscript reads correctly, at III 4 11[6] For *vardhayâ, tam agne vardhayâ tvam* (IV 6 3[1]) other cases are at I 5 5[2] IV 2 4[4], 7 13[5] For *bodhâ, bodhâ no asya vacaso yavishtha* (IV 2 3[4] G M omit the last two words) For *atrâ, atrâ te rûpam* (IV 6 7[3]) other cases are at IV 6 7[2],8[2] For *tatrâ, tatrâ ratham upa çagmam* (IV 6 6[3]) For *muñcâ, pra muñcâ svastaye* (III.2 8[3]) again at IV 7 15[7] For *açvasyâ, ekas tvashtur açvasyâ viçastâ* (IV 6 9[3]) For *prnasvâ, sapta yonîr â prnasvâ ghrtena* (I 5 3[3] and IV 6 5[5]) For *sthâ* after *hi, âpo hi shthâ mayobhuvah* (IV 1 5[1] V 6 1[4] VII 4 19[4]), and, as counter-example, to show that the correption takes place only after *hi, pratishthâ vâ ekavinçah* (V 2 3[6] et al) For *tarâ* after *tvam, agne tvam tarâ mrdhah* (IV 1 9[3]), with the counter-example *antaratarâ taptavrato bhavati* (VI 2 2[7] G M omit the last word) For *janishvâ, jani-*

8 ------ [1] *eteshv anavagraheshv antyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ avâ---- sac---- pra---- mr---- var---- çiksh---- rak---- adyâ---- bhav---- â go---- yat---- pra---- pibâ---- rip---- api vikrtam* (I 51) *apy akârâdi* (I 52) *iti dvâbhyâm*[2] *vacanâbhyâm prâ---- ity atra hrasvâdeçah kim na syât mâi 'vam api vikrtam* (I 51) *iti vacanam kanthoktapadavishayam*[3] *nâ tv akârâdipadavishayam*[4]. *prânâ* [5] *ity asyâ 'py akârâditvân nâ*

shvâ hi jenyo agne (iv 1 3[4] and v 1 4[5] G M omit *agne*) For *yukshvâ*, *yukshvâ hi devahûtamân* (ii.6 11[1] et al) other cases at iv 2 9[5] v 5 3[1,2] For *achâ*, *achâ nakshi dyumattamah* (i 5 6[3] and iv 4 4[8]) other cases at i 7 10[2] ii 2 12[8], 6 11[1] iv 2 4[2] twice, 4 4[2] (if my MS is correct, the Rik reads *acha*), 5 1[2], 6 7[5] but the compound *achâvâka* (vii.1 5[5]) is left undivided and unchanged

The occasion of the commentator's delay and discussion over the word *nâ* is given by the fact that the *pada*-text of the Tâittirîya Sanhitâ (unlike that of the Rik and Atharvan see note to Ath Pr iv 39) divides the word *prânâh* thus *pra-anâh* Hence, when we read in the Sanhitâ, as in the passage which he quotes, *prânâ vâ añçavah* (vi 4 4[4] W B read simply *prânâ vâi*, which occurs in various other places, e g v 3 8[2]), he fears that, having this division in mind, we shall be misled into believing that the specification *nâ* of the present rule applies to *prânâ*, because we are taught in the first chapter (i 51,52) that a word cited in any rule comes equally under that rule when phonetically altered, or preceded by *a* He sets aside this difficulty, however, by the arbitrary *dictum* that it is not permitted to vary the same word in both ways at once—that we may accept the altered form only of a vocable which is actually quoted entire, not of one made by the prefixion of an *a* to one so quoted hence, he infers, the present rule does not apply to [the *anâ* of] *prânâ*, as it begins with *a* But a further objection is interposed in that case, why does it not apply to the part *anâ* of the compound, in which is no altered *n*? He replies, because of the absence of a long vowel in *samhitâ*, in a word wearing this form—or, as would seem a better statement, because of the absence of any such word in *samhitâ* as *anâ* (for *anâh*) with a long vowel as its final The second objection, in fact, is a wholly futile one, scarcely worth the trouble of bringing up and setting aside The original difficulty is one growing out of the extension of the leading rule in the chapter to cases of final *â* in *samhitâ* where a *visarjanîya* has been lost after it (see note to rule 1) The answer has a somewhat quibbling aspect, but the rule of interpretation which it involves is in accordance with that adopted in one or two analogous cases elsewhere

अधाग्नियाज्ये ॥ ९ ॥

9 Also *adhâ*, in *agni* and *yâjyâ* passages

'yam vidhih tarhi vikrtatvâbhâvâd[6] *anâ ity asye*[7] *'ñygâñçasya*[8] *kim na syâd ayam vidhih evamrûpasya samhitâyâm dîrghâbhâvât dhâ-.... brh-.... dhar-.... uta.... tam.... bodhâ.... atrâ.... tat-.... pra.... ek-.... sap-.... âpo.... hî 'ti kim pra-.... agne.... tvam iti kim ant-.... jan-.... yuk-.... achâ....*

[1] G M ins *ity* [2] G M om [3] W *ktip-*, B om *pada* [4] B om *pada* [5] W ins *vâ* [6] G M *vâikrtasyâ 'bh-* [7] B G M om [8] B G M *-yâç-*

The commentator's first care is to define what parts of the Sanhitâ are styled *agni* and *yâjyâ* The former name, he says, designates those *mantras* which celebrate Agni—namely, the fourth *kânda* by the latter are intended the concluding *anuvâkas*, or sections, of every *praçna*, or chapter, from the beginning of the Sanhitâ to the third *praçna* of the fourth *kânda*, inclusive, and, besides, the eleventh *anuvâka* of *praçna* six, *kânda* two (i e i 1 14, 2 14, 3 14, 4 46, 5 11, 6 12, 7 13, 8 22 ii 1 11, 2 12, 3 14, 4 14, 5 12, 6 11, 12 iii 1 11, 2 11, 3 11, 4 11, 5 11 iv 1 11, 2 11, 3 13—in all, twenty-three *anuvâkas*) The name *agni* does not occur again the *yâjyâs* are the subject of further prescription below, in rules iii 11, ix 20, xi 3 The compound *agniyâjya* (neuter singular) is justified by a simple reference to Pânini's rule (ii 2 29) defining a copulative compound

The passages cited in illustration of the rule are *adhâ hy agne kratoh* (iv 4 4[7]), *adhâ ca nah çarma yacha dvibarhâh* (iv 5 10[3] G M omit the last word), *adhâ te sumnam îmahe* (ii 6 11[4]), and *adhâ yathâ nah pitarah* (ii 6 12[4] W B omit the last word) I have noted no other cases As counter example, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is quoted *adhâ me 'ti tad vishnave 'ti prâyachat* (ii 4 12[4] W B omit *prâyachat*), where *adhâ* stands for *adhâh* see, for the bearing of the exception, the note upon the introductory rule of the chapter

कुत्रादक्षिणेनास्वेनाहन्तनाजगामारुहेमाविद्मर्ध्यामाच-
कृमाक्षामास्तरीमाभरेमावर्षयथेरयथारिथापाथाथासिञ्चथा-
जनयथाजयतोक्षतावतायाताशृणुताकृणुताबिभृता ॥ १० ॥

10 Also *kutrâ*, *dakshinenâ*, *svenâ*, *hantanâ*, *jagâmâ*, *ruhemâ*, *vidmâ*, *rdhyâmâ*, *cakrmâ*, *kshâmâ*, *starîmâ*, *bharemâ*, *varshayathâ*, *îrayathâ*, *ârithâ*, *pâthâ*, *athâ*, *siñcathâ*, *janayathâ*, *jayatâ*, *ukshatâ*, *avatâ*, *yâtâ*, *çrnutâ*, *krnutâ*, *bibhrtâ*

The commentator's illustrative passages are for *kutrâ*, *kutrâ cid yasya samrtâu* (ii 1 11[3] G M omit the last word) For *dak-*

9 *agniç ca yâjyâ câ 'gniyâjyam*[1] *tasmin*[2] *câ 'rthe dvandva iti*[3] *samâsah agnir ity agniprakâçakamantrâ*[4] *lakshyante caturthakânda ity arthah. ubhâ vâm indrâgnî* (i 1 14[1]) *prabhrty agnir vrtrâni* (iv 3 13[1]) *paryantâh praçnottamânuvâkâ yâjyâsamjñâ bhavanti yukshvâ hi* (ii 6 11[1]) *ity anuvâkaç ca* [5]*atra vishaye*[5] *'dhe 'ty asmin*[6] *grahane 'ntyasvaro vibhâge*[7] *vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ adhâ hy---- adhâ ca---- adhâ te---- adhâ y---- agniyâjya iti kim adhâ m----*

[1] G M *jye* [2] G M *-inç* [3] G M om [4] B *-çaman-* [(5)] G M om [6] G M *etasmin* [7] G M om

shinenâ, dakshinenâ vasûni patih sindhûnâm asi (iii 4 11[4] G M omit after *vasûni*) For *svenâ, svenâ hi vrtrañ çavasâ jaghantha* (vii 4 15 B omits the last word, G M the last two) For *hantanâ, tapasâ hantanâ tam* (iv 3 13[4]) For *jagâmâ, â jagâmâ parasyâh* (i 6 12[5]) For *ruhemâ, asravantîm â ruhemâ svastaye* (i 5 11[5]) For *vidmâ, vidmâ te agne tredhâ trayâni vidmâ te* (iv 2 2[1] G M stop at *agne*, thus instancing only one of the two cases, there are two more in the same verse) also at i 7 13[3] ii 6 11[4] For *rdhyâmâ, rdhyâmâ ta ohâih* (iv 4 4[7]) For *cakrmâ, cakrmâ kac canâ "gah* (iv 7 15[6]) other cases at i 8 3 ii 6 12[2] iv 1 11[1], 6 8[3] For *kshâmâ, kshâmâ rerihad vîrudhah* (i 3 14[2] iv 2 1[2],2[2] G M omit the last word) other cases at ii 6 12[4] iv 7 12[3] For *starîmâ, sushtarîmâ jushânâ* (v 1 11[2]) here the application of rule i 51 becomes necessary For *bharemâ, añhomuce pra bharemâ manîshâm* (i 6 12[3] G M omit the last word) For *varshayathâ, yûyam vrshtim varshayathâ purîshinah* (ii 4 8[2] W B omit the first word) For *îrayathâ, ud îrayathâ marutah* (ii 4 8[2]) For *ârithâ, yoner udârithâ yaje tam* (iv 6 5[4]) For *pâthâ, kshaye pâthâ divo vimahasah* (iv 2 11[2]) For *athâ, athâ somasya prayatî yuvabhyâm* (i 1 14[1] G M omit the last word) other cases are numerous, namely i 1 13[1] twice, 5 5[2],11[3], 6 4[2] twice, 7 13[4] ii 3 14[3], 6 12[2] iii 1 11[2], 4 11[6] iv 2 1[4],4[4],5[3],6[1,2], 6 3[4] twice, 7 13[5], and, as I doubt not, at the end of iii 2 11[2], where, however, the present *samhitâ*-text reads *atha*, because the word stands *vibhâge* For *siñcathâ, yatrâ naro marutah siñcathâ madhu* (iii 1 11[8]) For *janayathâ, âpo janayathâ ca nah* (iv 1 5[1] v 6 1[4] vii 4 19[4]) For *jayatâ, upa pre 'ta jayatâ nara sthirâh* (iv 6 4[4] G M omit the last word) For *ukshatâ, â ghrtam ukshatâ madhuvarnam* (iv 3 13[8]) For *avatâ, asmân u devâ avatâ haveshu* (iv 6 4[4]) another case at iv 2 6[3] For *yâtâ, devâ rathâir yâtâ hiranyayâih* (iv 7 12[1] G M omit the first word) For *çrnutâ, marutah çrnutâ havam* (iv 2 11[2]) For *krnutâ, samvatsarâya krnutâ brhan namah* (v 7 2[4]) Finally, for *bibhrtâ, mâte 'va putram bibhrtâ sv enam* (iv 2 3[2] W B. begin at *putram*)

भरता याज्यासु ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also *bharatâ*, in *yâjyâ* passages

---

10 ...... *ity*[1] *eteshv anavagraheshv*[2] *antyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ kutrâ.... daksh-.... svenâ.... tap-.... âj-.... asr-.... vidmâ.... rdhy-.... cakr-.... kshâ-.... sushṭ-.... añh-.... yûyam.... ud..... yoner... kshaye.... athâ.... yatrâ.... âpo.... upa.... â.... asmân.... devâ.... mar-.... sam-.... mâ-....*

[1] G M om [2] W *avag*, G M om

Which are the sections called *yâjyâ* has been pointed out above, under rule 9

The cited passages are *bharatâ vasuvittamam* (iii 5 11^{4}), *bharatâ jâtavedasam* (iii 5 11^{1}), and *pûrvyam vaco 'gnaye bharatâ brhat* (iii 2 11^{1} G M omit the first two words), which are all that the text contains As counter-example, to show the necessity of restricting the change to *yâjyâ* passages, is quoted *esha vo bharatâ râjâ* (i 8 10^{2},12^{2}), where *bharatâ* stands for *bharatâh* If the text contained a *bharatâ* as instrumental of the participle *bharant*, it would come more properly under the action of the rule, and would have better right to be specifically excluded, but I have not found such a form anywhere Respecting *bharatâ* as standing in *samhitâ* for *bharatâh*, see what is said in the note to the first rule of this chapter

अत्ताभवतानदतातरतातपताजुहुतावोचतामुञ्चताचृ-ताघुष्याजनयावर्तयासादयापारयादीयाहराभरापाससादा-सृजातिष्ठायेना ॥ १२ ॥

12 Also *attâ*, *bhavatâ*, *anadatâ*, *taratâ*, *tapatâ*, *juhutâ*, *vocatâ*, *amuñcatâ*, *crtâ*, *ghushyâ*, *janayâ*, *vartayâ*, *sâdayâ*, *pârayâ*, *dîyâ*, *harâ*, *bharâ*, *apâ*, *sasâdâ*, *srjâ*, *tishthâ*, and *yenâ*

The cited passages are for *attâ*, *attâ havînshi* (ii 6 12^{2}) For *bhavatâ*, *âdityâso bhavatâ mrdayantah* (i 4 22 and ii 1 11^{4}) For *anadatâ*, *samprayatîr ahâv anadatâ hate* (v 6 1^{2} W B omit the first word) For *taratâ*, *suvo ruhânâs taratâ rajânsi* (iii 5 4^{2} G M omit the first word) For *tapatâ*, *gharmam na sâmam tapatâ suvrktibhih* (i 6 12^{2} W B O [O begins in the comment to this rule] omit before *tapatâ*) For *juhutâ*, *pitre juhutâ viçvakarmane* (iv 6 2^{6}) For *vocatâ*, *viçve devâso adhi vocatâ me* (iv 7 14^{2} G M omit to *adhi*) For *amuñcatâ*, *padi shitâm amuñcatâ yajatrâh* (iv 7 15^{7}) For *crtâ*, *ayasmayam vi crtâ bandham etam* (iv 2 5^{3}) For *ghushyâ*, *parushparur anu ghushyâ viçasta* (iv 6 9^{3}) For *janayâ*, *manur bhava janayâ dâivyam janam* (iii 4 2^{2},3^{7}) For *vartayâ*, *tâbhir â vartayâ punah* (iii 3 10^{1}) For *sâdayâ*, *sâdayâ yajñam sukrtasya yonâu* (iii 5 11^{2} and iv 1 3^{3}) For *pârayâ*, *agne tvam pârayâ navyo asmân* (i 1 14^{4} all but W omit the last word) For *dîyâ*, *brhaspate pari dîyâ rathena* (iv 6 4^{1,2} the text reads *dîya*, as the word stands before the division between the first and second fifty of the section) another case is iii 1 11^{6} For *harâ*, *nihâram in ni me harâ nihâram*

11 *bharatâ ity asmin*[1] *grahane*[2] *'ntyasvaro yâjyâvishaye*[3] *vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ bhar-.... bhar-.... pûr-.... yâjyâsv iti kim esha....*

[1] G M *etasmin* [2] B *avagraheshv* [3] G M *yâjyayâm*, and put before the preceding word

(i 8 4^{1}) For *bharâ*, *mâ no mardhîr â bharâ dadhi tan nah pra dâçushe* (i 7 13^{3} O omits after *bharâ*, B G M after *dadhi*) there is no other case, *bharâ* at i 3 14^{3} in the Calcutta edition being an erratum For *apâ*, *duro na vâjan̄ çrutyâ apâ vrdhi* (ii 2 12^{6} W B omit the first two words) For *sasâdâ*, *agnir hotâ ni shasâdâ yajîyân* (i.3 14^{1} and iv 1 3^{4} G M omit the first word) there is another case at iv 6 2^{1}, requiring, like the others, the application of rule i 51 For *srjâ*, *srjâ vrshtim divah* (ii 4 8$^{2}_{1}$,10^{3}) there are other cases at ii 4 8^{2} iii 5 5^{2},10^{1} iv 1 8^{3} For *tishthâ*, *tishthâ devo na savitâ* (iv 1 4^{2}) other cases at iii 1 4^{1} v 2 1^{4}, and perhaps also at iv 1 2^{3}, where the word ends a division of the *anuvâka* For *yenâ*, *yenâ sahasram vahasi* (iv 7 13^{4} and v 7 7^{3})

उश्मसीक्रयीकृधीश्रुधीयदी ॥ १३ ॥

13 Also *uçmasî*, *krayî*, *krdhî*, *çrudhî*, and *yadî*

The quoted examples for these words, being the only ones which the text contains, are as follows For *uçmasî*, *te te dhâmâny uçmasî gamadhye* (i 3 6^{1} ^{2} W B O omit the first three words), here, as *uçmasî* stands at the end of a division, or *vibhâge*, its *î* is short in the accepted text For *krayî*, *rudra yat te krayî param nâma* (i.8 14^{2}) For *krdhî*, *krdhî sv asmân aditeh* (iv 7 15^{7} W B O omit the last word) For *çrudhî*, *imam me varuna çrudhî havam* (ii 1 11^{6}) For *yadî*, *yadî bhûmim janayan* (iv 6 2^{4})

सूतूनूमिथूमक्षूऊ ॥ १४ ॥

14 Also *sû*, *tû*, *nû*, *mithû*, *makshû*, and *û*

The cited passages are as follows for *sû*, *mo shû na indra* (i 8 3) For *tû*, *â tû na upa gantana* (i 5 11^{4} ^{5}) there are two other cases, i 7 13^{3} ii 2 12^{7}, both after *â* For *nû*, *etaçasya nû rane* (iv 6 1^{2}) For *mithû*, *gâtrâny asinâ mithû kah* (iv 6 9^{4} G M omit the first word) For *makshû*, *makshû devavato rathah* (i.8 22^{3}) For *û*, a part of the manuscripts give two examples,

---

12 ...... *eteshv anavagraheshv*[1] *antyasvaro* [2] *vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ attâ.... âd-.... sampr-.... suvo...., ghar-.... pitre.... viçve.... padi .. ayas-.... par-.... man-.... tâbh-.... sâd-.... agne .... brh-.... nih-.... mâ.... duro.... agnir.... srjâ.... tish-.... yenâ....*

[1] W *av-*, G M *gvahaneshu* [2] O begins here

13 ...... *ity*[1] *eteshv*[2] *anavagraheshv*[3] *antyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ te.... rudra.... krdhî.... imam.... yadî....*

[1] G M om [2] G M *eshv* [3] W *av*, G M om

asmâbhir û nu praticakshyâ 'bhût (i 4 3^{3} wanting in G M), and *ûrdhva û shu na utaye* (iv 1 4^{2} W B O omit the first word, G M the last) other cases are found at i 5 11^{5} ii 5 12^{2} iii 5 10^{1} iv 1 10^{3}, 6 5^{6} v 1 5^{3} vii 1 18^{2}, 6 17^{2}

व्युत्पूर्व आननुदात्तो ऽनूष्मवत्यनूष्मवति ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also *ân*, when unaccented, and preceded by *vi* or *ut*, in a word containing no spirant

This rule applies simply to the compounds *vyâna* and *udâna*, in which the long *â* of the radical syllable is treated by the *pada*-text as the effect of an irregular prolongation The words are instanced by the commentator in their full *pada*-form, *vyânâye 'ti vi-anâya* (iii.5 8 et al), and *udânâye 'ty ut anâya* (iv 2 9^{1} et al). In the same manner, *prânâya* and *apânâya* are divided into *pra--anâya* and *apa-anâya* As regards the treatment of this group of compounds, the different *pada*-texts are somewhat inconsistent and somewhat conflicting The Atharvan *pada* (see Ath Pr iv 39) divides *vi-âna* and *sam-âna*, without correption of the radical *â*, but leaves *prâna* and *apâna* undivided The Rik *pada* does not divide *prâna* I do not know that any of the others are Rik words The White Yajus, again (Vâj Pr v 33,36), divides *apa-âna* and *sam--âna*, but not *prâna* The consistency of the Tâittirîya *çâkhinaḥ* is to be commended, less, perhaps, their assumption that the *â* of *âna* is a mere Vedic irregularity, requiring restoration to a correcter form They also, it may be remarked, divide *prâṇatha* (iv 1 4^{1}) into *pra-anatha*

The commentator goes on to cite counter-examples, proving the necessity of the restrictions imposed by the rule To show that *ân* is to be shortened only after *vi* and *ut*, he gives *yad ânrcus tene 'yam* (vii.3 1^{3} W B O omit the last word), and *paryânîyâ havanîyasya* (vii 1 6^{6}) To show that only *ân*, not *â* followed by any other consonant, is shortened, he quotes *yad rukmam vyâghâ-rayati* (v 2 7^{5}), and *udâdâya prthivîm jîradânuḥ* (i.1 9^{3} G M omit the last word) To show that the *ân* must not be accented, he gives *viçvákarmâ vyâ'nat* (iv 2 10^{4}), and *néshtah pátnîm udâ'-naya* (vi 5 8^{6}) Finally, to show that the presence of a spirant in the word prevents the correption, we have *pathâ madhor dhârâ vyânaçuh* (v 7 7^{3} all but W omit the first word), and *ud ânishur mahîr iti* (v 6 1^{3})

The question is now in point, how complete is this rehearsal of the cases of prolonged vowels occurring in the Sanhitâ, or, how closely does the *pada*-text which it assumes correspond with that

14 ------ *ity*[1] *eteshv*[2] *anavagraheshv*[3] *antyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate yathâ. mo----· â---- eta---- gâ---- mak----· asm---- ûrdhva----*

[1] G M om [2] G M *eshv* [3] W *av-*, G M om

found in the existing *pada*-manuscripts? As regards the latter point, I am unable to speak with certainty, of course, without the possession of a *pada*-manuscript, and its careful examination throughout, but so much as this I can say—that, having referred a liberal selection of the most questionable cases to Dr Haug at Munich, for verification in his *pada*-texts, no instance of a discordance between these and the Prâtiçâkhya has come to light Among the cases referred were several in regard to which I was beforehand very confident that I had caught the authors of the Prâtiçâkhya in fault Thus *yojâ*, in the refrain *yojâ nv indra te harî* (i 8 $5^{1,2}$), which is shortened to *yoja* in the *pada*-texts both of the Rik (by Rik Pr vii 7) and the White Yajus (by Vâj Pr iii 106), remains *yojâ* in that of our Sanhitâ Again, *eva* occurs six times in our text with its final lengthened (viz at i 8 22^2 ii 1 11^3 iv 2 9^2, 3 13^3, 7 15^7 v 2 8^3), as it does also not infrequently in the other Vedic texts (as noticed and provided for in their Prâtiçâkhyas see Rik Pr vii 12,19, viii 20 Vâj Pr iii 123 Ath Pr iii 16, note, I 1 *c*) but the Tâittirîya *pada* reads in each case *evâ* Once more, in the passage *tava dharmâ yuyopima* (Rig-Veda vii 89 5, Ath Veda vi 51 3, Tâitt Sanh iii 4 11^6), the *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan read *dharma* (I do not find that the case is noted in the Rik Pr, in the Ath Pr it would fall under the comprehensive rule iii.16), while that of our Sanhitâ has *dharmâ*, like the *samhitâ*-reading

I will add, as received from the same quarter, a few words respecting which a question might naturally arise as to how they were treated in the *pada*-text Separated, without correption of the long vowel at the end of their first member, are *uttarâ-vat* (v 4 8^5), *sahasâ-van* (i 6 12^6), *malmalâ-bhavant* (i 4 34), *vrshâ-kapi* (i 7 13^2), such copulative compounds as *indrâ-varunayoh* (ii 5 12^2) and *agnâ-vishnû* (i.1 12), and *ûrnâ-mradas* (i 1 11^1 while, nevertheless, we have *ûrna-mradas* at i 2 2^2, the *pada*-reading agreeing in both cases with that of the *samhitâ* where the Calcutta edition gets its authority for reading *ûrnâmniradas* and *ûrnamnmradas* is more than I can imagine)

---

15 *vî 'ty evampûrva utpûrvo vâ "n ity esha* [1] *svaro 'nudâtto 'nûshmavaty*[2] *ûshmarahite pade vartamâno vyañjanaparah padâdâu vartamânatvât pûrvapadena*[3] *vibhâge sati hrasvam âpadyate yathâ vyânâye 'ti vi-anâya udânâye 'ty ut-anâya evampûrva iti kim yad---- pary---- nakârah kimarthah· yad---- udâ----· anudâtta iti kim viçv---- nesh---- anûshmavatî 'ti kim pathâ---- ud----*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
trtîyo 'dhyâyah[4]

[1] G M ins *âkâra* [2] W *ûshm-* [3] G M *-de* [4] G M add *çrîkrshnâya namah*

Not separated, and therefore, of course, without correption of the vowel, are such words as *ṛtâshât* (iii 4 7[1]) and *turâshât* (i 7 13[4]), also *tvashṭîmant* (i 2 5[2]), *anyâdṛç* (i.8 13[2]), *ubhayâdat* (ii 2 6[3]), *arâtîyant* (i 6 1[1]) and *arâtîvan* (vii 4 15), *atîkâça* (i 2 2[2]) and *prâkâça* (i 8 18), *avâçṛṅga* (ii 1 8[5]) and *prâçṛṅga* (ii.1 3[1] as I doubt not my information is deficient for this word), *upânah* (v 4 4[4]), *nîvâra* (iv 7 4[2]) and *nîhâra* (iv 6 2[2]), and *purûravah* (i.3 7[1])

There is not, as in the other Vedic texts, any restoration of a theoretically correct short vowel which is not strictly a final or initial thus we read in *pada*-text, for example, *vâvṛdhe* (i 4 20), *sâsahat* (i 3 14[7]), and *ushâsam* (iv 4 4[2])

Many of these items constitute striking peculiarities of the Tâittirîya *pada*, and its careful study and comparison with the other works of its class would undoubtedly bring to light much that is curious

---

CHAPTER IV

CONTENTS 1–4, introductory, 5–54, rehearsal of cases of *pragrahas*, or uncombinable final vowels.

अथ प्रग्रहाः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now the *pragrahas*

A simple heading to the chapter, and explained as such by the commentator The same subject is treated by the other Prâtiçâkhyas, at Rik Pr i 18–19, Vâj Pr i.92–98, Ath Pr i 73–82 It occupies here a great deal more space, because the Tâitt Pr avoids on principle the mention of grammatical categories in its rules, and is at infinite pains to catalogue, word by word, what the other treatises dispose of summarily, by classes A rule in a later chapter (x 24) teaches that all the vowels here rehearsed and defined as *pragraha* are exempt from euphonic combination The term *pragraha* is peculiar to this treatise, the rest using instead *pragṛhya*

नावग्रहः ॥ २ ॥

2 No former member of a compound is *pragraha*

As the former member of a separable compound (*avagraha* i 49) is regarded and treated as an independent *pada*, the rules declaring certain final vowels *pragraha* would apply to the finals

---

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah. pragrahâ ucyanta ity [1]etad[2] adhikṛtam veditavyam ita[1] uttaram yad vakshyâmah*

(1) W om [2] G M om

of such members, but for this prescription to the contrary The commentator cites rules 5,6,36,37,49 of the chapter as needing the restriction of their application here made, and quotes from the Sanhitâ in illustration *tanûnapâd asurah* (iv 1 8[1] the *tanû* of *tanû-napât* would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 5), *agoargham yajamânam* (vi 1 10[1] *ago-argham* would fall else under rule 6), *agnîshomâu mâ* (ii 5 2[2] it is implied that the *pada*-text would write *agnî-somâu*, bringing the word within the sphere of rule 36 such compounds are not divisible in the other Vedic texts), and *dvedve puronuvâkye kuryât* (ii 2 9[2] the *pada* writes *dve-dve*, so that both members would be declared alike *pragraha* by rule 49) The present precept is therefore declared to be one making exceptions in advance to the rules specified

अन्तः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Only a final is *pragraha*

Or, as the commentator paraphrases, the end of a word is entitled to the designation *pragraha* He cites, as example, the phrase *devate samṛddhyâi* (ii.1 9[3]) The necessity of the rule, he explains, arises out of the fact that the following rules, in part—for example, rules 5,6,33—describe certain letters or syllables as *pragraha* without farther limitation, and it is desirable to specify that they bear that character only when final This in answer to the criticizing inquiry "whether a letter not final can also be *pragraha*?"—that is, as I understand it, whether this predicate is not in the nature of things restricted to finals? But now a yet more troublesome objection is raised. The limitation to finals, urges the interpellator, is otherwise assured, for the word *api* of the next rule, in the sequel of this one, brings into action the principle "continued implication is of that which is last" (i 58) The objection is wholly futile and inept, both as implying that false interpretation of the rule appealed to to which attention was directed in the note upon it, and as attributing to *api* a mysterious force to which it can lay no claim whatever Instead, however, of showing the

---

2. *avagrahah pragraho na bhavati ûkârah* (iv 5) *okâro 'sâñhito 'kâravyañjanaparah* (iv 6) *gnî* (iv 36) *na hiparah* (iv 37) *dve* (iv 49) *iti vakshyate*[1] *etad*[2] *uddiçya purastâdapavâdo 'nena vidhîyate yathâ*[3] *tan----- ago----· agn----- dve----- avagraha*[4] *iti jâtyapekshâyâm ekavacanam*

[1] W *-ti*, B O om [2] G M *tad* [3] G M om [4] G M *nâ 'v*

3 *padasyâ 'ntah pragrahasamjño bhavati yathâ dev----- atra 'ha kim apadânto 'pi pragrahah syât atro 'cyate ûkârah* (iv 5) *ity aviçeshena vakshyati okâro 'sâñhito 'kâravyañjanaparah* (iv 6) *iti cî yatprâparah* (iv 33) *iti ca apadântasyo 'kârasyâu 'kârasya cîçabdasya vâ pragrahatvam*[1] *mâ bhûd iti*

objector to the door, the commentator proceeds elaborately to confute him. "We reply, not so: specification of finality is appropriate where there is a congeries of several letters; here, on the other hand, there is indication of a single letter. If the matter in question were the euphonic alteration or elision of *û* and the other letters treated of, a final would be designated in virtue of the principle quoted; but here it is a simple case of application of the term *pragraha*, not of an affected nor an affecting letter: hence continued implication has no force."

इतिपरो ऽपि ॥४॥

4. It is followed by *iti*.

This is the interpretation of the commentator, who declares that the "also" (*api*) brings in by implication, from the first rule of the preceding chapter, the specification *vibhâge*, 'in case of separation,' or in the *pada* or other artificially divided texts. As example, he cites *ubhe iti* (i 4 22 et al.: G. M. add *devate iti*, ii 1 9[3] et al.)

If such be its real meaning, the rule is a very anomalous one, as giving a single direct prescription respecting the mode of construction of the secondary texts. These are elsewhere only referred to or implied, in a more indirect manner. I should therefore prefer to translate 'even when followed by *iti*'—that is to say, a word here defined as *pragraha* in the ordinary text has that character also in the other texts before *iti*, not being combined with the latter.

ऊकारः ॥५॥

5. A long *û* is *pragraha*.

---

nanu siddham evâi 'tat etatsûtraçeshabhûta[2] *uttarasûtre*[3] *'piçabdenâ 'nvâdeço 'ntyasya* (i 58) *eva kâryanirvâhât*[4] *ne 'ti brûmah anekavarnasamudâye hy antyatvam*[5] *upapannam ayam punar ekavarnanirdeçah ûkârah* (iv 5) *ity âdivarnasya yâu vikâralopâu tayor* [6] *anvâdeço 'ntyasya* (i 58) *ity anenâ "ntyah pragraha ity uktam*[7] *pragrahasamjñâmâtram*[8] *na tu*[9] *nimittam nimittî vâ tasmâd anvâdeço na prasarati*

[1] G. M. *grahanam*. [2] B. O. *çeshe*, G. M. *bhût*. [3] G. M. *ottarasya su-*. [4] G. M. *-vâhakah*. [5] B. O. *anta-*. [6] G. M. ins. *eva*. [(7)] G. M. *'ntyapratyaya uktah*. [8] G. M. *ha iti sam-*. [9] B. O. om.

4. *apiçabdah sinhâvalokanenâ 'thâ "dâv uttare vibhâge* (iii 1) *ity atra vibhâgapadam*[1] *anvâdiçati so 'yam pragraho vibhâga itiparo bhavati yathâ* [2] *ubhe iti itiçabdah paro yasmâd asâv itiparah*

[1] G. M. *gam*. [2] G. M. ins. *devate iti*.

The commentator adds the limitation that, "if long in *pada*-text," the final *û* is universally *pragraha*, referring, in justification, to the cases treated of above, in rule iii 14, of an *u* irregularly lengthened in *samhitâ* His examples are *hanû vâ ete yajñasya* (vi 2 11[3] W B O omit the last word), *vâsantikâv rtû çukraç ca* (iv 4 11[1] W B O omit after *rtû*), and *harinasya bâhû upastutam janima tat te arvan* (iv 2 8[1] G M omit the last four words, the others, the first word)

ओकारो ऽसांहितो ऽकारव्यञ्जनपरः ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also an *o* which is not the product of euphonic combination, if followed by *a* or a consonant

Of words exhibiting in *pada*-text, as well as in *samhitâ*, a final *o*, there are (apart from the theme *go*, which occurs only as first member of a compound, and therefore, by rule 2 of this chapter, does not require to be regarded in the determination of *pragrahas*) two classes, the one composed of vocatives from themes in *u*, the other of words whose final *a* or *â* is combined with the particle *u* The present rule deals, in general, with the former class, the one next following, with the latter class The right of the vocatives in *o* to be treated as *pragrahas* is a very dubious one, and is not unequivocally supported by the Prâtiçâkhya, for to say that such words are *pragraha* before *a* or a consonant is not to distinguish them perceptibly from the euphonic *o* which comes from a final *as*, since this also is not capable of combination with a consonant, and does not necessarily absorb a following initial *a* The only instances in which a vocative in *o* exhibits a *pragraha* character are the three which are cited under the next rule (i 4 27 v 7 2[4]. vi 5 8[3]), the cases in which it is regularly changed to *av* before other vowels than *a* are much more numerous namely, before *â*, at i 4 39 ii 2 12[4], 6 11[1] vi 4 3[3], before *i*, at ii 2 12[8], before *u*, at i 2 13[2] twice, 6 12[3] iii 2 10[1], before *e*, at ii 4 12[3] I have noted but two cases in the text where such an *o* stands before initial *a* without absorbing it, they are found at i 3 8[1],14[7] And there are the same

---

5 *ûkârah padântah sarvatra pragraho bhavati padasamaye vartamânah yathâ hanû---- vâs---- har---- padasamaye vartamâna iti kim sûtânûmithûmakshûû*[1] (iii 14) *ity âdi*

[1] G M omit after *mithu*

6 *asâmhita okâro 'kâraparo vâ*[1] *vyañjanaparo vâ pragrahah syât yathâ vad---- vish---- asâmhita iti kim so----:* [2]*pra---- evampara iti kim*[2] *vish---- samhitânimittah sâmhitah na sâmhito 'sâmhitah akâraç ca vyañjanam câ 'kâravyañjane te pare yasmât sa tatho 'ktah*

[1] G M om [(2)] W B O om

number of cases—namely, at ii 5 12[5] and vi 4 3[4]—in which it causes the elision of a following *a*

The commentator's citations in illustration of the rule are *vadmâ hi suno asi* (i 3 14[7]), and *vishno havyañ rakshasva* (i 1 3) To show the necessity of the limitation *asâmhitah*, he cites *so 'bravît* (ii.1 2[1] et al), and *pra so agne* (iii 2 11[1] omitted, however, by W B O), where *so* is the *samhitâ* reading for *sah*, and, to show that the prescribed quality belongs to the vowel only before *a* or a consonant (the *lacuna* of W B O extends through this explanation), he gives us *vishnav e 'hî 'dam* (ii 4 12[3])

For the teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas respecting this class of asserted *pragrahas*, see the note to Ath Pr i 81

समह्र्दथपित्पूर्वश्च ॥ ७ ॥

7 As also, when preceded by *s*, *m*, *h*, *d*, *th*, and *pit*

The *anuvrtti* of this rule is even more blind and equivocal than usual Instead of bringing down either the subject or predicate of the one preceding, we are to bring down both, only with the exclusion of one of the modifications included in the former The meaning is, that an original *o*, preceded as here specified, is *pragraha* even when followed by other vowels than *a* The commentator is in error in saying that *ca* implies *okârah* from above, he should have said *okâro 'sâmhitah*

As above remarked, this rule chiefly concerns the class of *pragrahas* composed of words whose final vowel, *a* or *â*, is combined with the particle *u* Of these, *atho* is vastly the most numerous, occurring about two hundred and fifty times in the Sanhitâ Before *a* it is met with twenty times, always without occasioning elision, before other vowels, twenty-nine times, always uncombined Along with it, *tatho* is had in view by the rule, as presenting a final *o* after *th* it is found but once, in the passage cited by the commentator (see below) The only word showing *o* after *s* is *so*, found only in two passages, as noted below After *m*, we have *o* both in *mo* (in two passages, once before *sh*, at i 8 3, the other is cited by the commentator) and in *imo*, which latter is found only before *a* (iv 3 13[6]), and so does not necessarily come within the purview of the rule The other words of the class occur before consonants alone, and are, therefore, here made no account of they are *o* (once, i 4 33), *to*

---

7 *pûrvoktaparanimittâbhâve 'pi kâryavidhânârtham okâram viçinashti cakâra okâram anvâdiçati sa ma ha da tha pit evampûrvo 'sâmhita okâro 'kâravyañjanâbhyâm anyaparo 'pi pragraho bhavati yathâ so---- mâ---- upa----- indo ---- tatho---- sa---- evampûrva iti kim.* [1]*çat---- asâmhita iti kim*[1] *pra----*

(1) B om

(i.2 5² and vi.1 8⁵) and *uto* (five times), *upo* (four times), and *pro* (i 7 13⁵)

Of the remaining specifications of the rule, the *h* is made for but a single case of the exclamation *ho*, which the commentator quotes *upahûtâñs ho ity âha* (ii 6 7³), the *d* is for the vocative *indo*, which occurs twice *indo indriyâvatah* (i 4 27), and *indo ity âha* (vi.5 8³) the commentator quotes the latter passage, the *pit* is for the vocative *pito*, only found once, as cited *sa no mayobhûh pito â viçasva* (v 7 2⁴ ⁵ W B O omit the first three words) These three, as was noted under the preceding rule, are the only instances which the Sanhitâ affords of vocatives in *o* showing an uncombinable quality

The commentator's explanation of the rule is "the *o* is here specially distinguished in order to the prescription of its quality even in the case of absence of the sequent determining circumstances before stated" As examples of words whose ending is combined with *u*, after the consonants specified, he gives *so evâi 'shâi 'tasya* (ii 2 9⁷, 5 5⁵), *mâ bher mâro mo eshâm* (iv 5 10¹), and *tatho evo 'ttare nir vapet* (iii 4 9⁷ W B O omit after *uttare*) His counter-examples are *çatakratav ud vañçam iva* (i 6 12³ G M omit *iva*), and *pra so agne* (iii 2 11¹) but G M, which have given the latter passage under the preceding rule, here substitute for it *mâ so asmâñ avahâya* (v 7 9¹), their separate application is manifest

The treatment by the Prâtiçâkhya of words ending in *o* is awkward and bungling to a degree quite rare or wholly unknown elsewhere in its rules We should be justified in inferring from its statements that *o*, *to*, *uto*, *upo* and *pro* were not regarded as *pragrahas* at all, nor the vocatives in *o* except under the conditions and in the places specified, and that (if the commentator's explanation of rule 4 is accepted) they are not written with *iti* in the *pada* text while, doubtless, in every *pada*-text of the Black Yajus, as in those of the other Vedas, each word is treated uniformly, whether it happen to exhibit its uncombinable quality in *samhitâ* or not Through the rest of the chapter, it will be noticed, the words mentioned are defined as *pragrahas*, without regard to the circumstances in which they may stand in the text

अथैकारेकारौ ॥ ८ ॥

8 Now follow cases of *e* and *î*

This is a heading for the remainder of the chapter, excluding all other vowels than final *e* and *î* from the action of its rules The words exhibiting such finals are, of course, mainly duals, and are by the other treatises simply defined as such, with immense saving of trouble

---

8 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah ekârekârâu*[1] *pragrahatvena vidhîyete*[2] *ity etad*[3] *adhikrtam veditavyam*

[1] G M *ekâra îkarah* [2] W O *yate*, B *-yayate*, G M *viçishyata* [3] G M om

अस्मे ॥ ९ ॥

9 *Asme* is *pragraha*

The example cited by the commentator is, according to W B O, *asme te bandhuh* (i 2 7), according to G M, *sampatte gor asme candrâni* (also i 2 7) Neither exhibits in *samhitâ* the *pragraha* quality of the word, as is done at i 7 13[5] and elsewhere *asme* is not uncommon in the Sanhitâ, occurring twenty-nine times

त्वे इत्यनिङ्ग्यान्तः ॥ १० ॥

10 Also *tve*, when not the final member of a separable compound

The office of the word *iti* in this rule is differently explained by the two versions of the commentary W B O say that it indicates the quality of a separable cited word (they mean, doubtless, of an inseparable), G M, that it indicates *pragraha* quality Each interpretation is as good, and as worthless, as the other The commentary is not infrequently at much pains to put some special, even wonderful, significance into *iti* when found in a rule, and generally with as little acceptable result as here

The pronoun *tve* occurs seven times in the Sanhitâ (at i 3 14[2] 4 46[1] iii 1 11[7], 5 10[1] iv 2 7[3], 6 5[4] vi 1 8[5]), exhibiting its *pragraha*-quality in *samhitâ* only once (at iv 2 7[3]) The commentator's instance is *tve kratum api* (iii 5 10[1] G M omit *api*), and his counter-instance, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is *anâgâstve aditıtve turâsah* (ii.1 11[6] G M omit *turâsah*), where the *pada*-text reads *anâgâh-tve aditi-tve*

देवतेऽभेभागधेऊर्ध्वेविशाखेशृङ्गेऽनेमेध्येतृक्षेतृष्येकनी-
निकेपार्श्वेशिवेचोत्तमेऽवोत्तरेशिप्रेरथंतरेवत्सरस्यरूपेवि-
रूपेविषुरूपेसदोहविर्धानेऽधिषवणेऽहोरात्रेधृतव्रतेस्तुत-

---

9 *asme ity asmin*[1] *grahane 'ntyasvarah pragraho bhavati yathâ asme....*

[1] G M *etasmin*

10 *itiçabda iñgyagrahanatvam*[1] *dyotayati · aniñgyântas tve ity esha çabdah pragraho bhavati yathâ tve.... aniñgyânta iti kim anâ-.... iñgyasyâ 'nta iñgyântah. ne 'ñgyânto 'niñgyântah.*

[1] G M *pragrahatvam* T W B O write *ingy-* throughout

शब्दे॑ अक्रमा॑मे॑ श्रक्तो॑श्रपि॑तेर्वतेपूर्तेप्रत्तेविधृतेश्रनृतेश्रच्छिद्र-
बहुलेपूर्वजेकृणुध्वंसदने ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also *devate*, *ubhe*, *bhâgadhe*, *ûrdhve*, *viçâkhe*, *çrñge*, *ene*, *medhye*, *trnne*, *trdye*, *kanînike*, *pârçve*, *cive*, *co 'ttame*, *evo 'ttare*, *cipre*, *rathamtare*, *vatsarasya rûpe*, *virûpe*, *vishurûpe*, *sadohavirdhâne*, *adhishavane*, *ahorâtre*, *dhrtavrate*, *stutaçastre*, *rksâme*, *akte*, *arpite*, *râivate*, *pûrte*, *pratte*, *vidhrte*, *anrte*, *achidre*, *bahule*, *pûrvaje*, *krnudhvañ sadane*

For the *pragrahas* catalogued in this rule—all of them dual cases of feminines and neuters—the commentator quotes illustrative passages as follows For *devate*, *devate samrddhyâi mâitram* (ii 1 9³ the last word in G M only) For *ubhe*, G M have *achidre bahule ubhe vyacasvatî samvasâthâm* (iv 1 3⁴), but W B O, blunderingly, *ime eva rasenâ 'nakti* (vi 3 11³ B O have *ubhe* for *ime*) the word occurs also in other passages For *bhâgadhe*, *bhâgadhe bhâgadhâ asmâi* (ii 5 6⁶) also in the preceding division of the same *anuvâka*, and at v 5 9² As counter-example, to show that *dhe* (itself a *pada*, *bhâga-dhe*) would not have answered the purpose alone, we have *agna udadhe* (v 5 9¹ *pada*-text, *uda-dhe*) For *ûrdhve*, *ûrdhve samidhâv â dadhâti* (ii 6 6³ and vi 2 1⁶) For *viçâkhe*, *viçâkhe nakshatram* (iv 4 10²) and as counter-example, to show the necessity of including the *vi* (of *vi-çâkhe*), we have *tasmint sahasraçâkhe*, stated to be found "in the text of another school" About a score of such alleged citations from "another text," assumed to have been had in view by the authors of the Prâtiçâkhya in constructing their rules, are given in various parts of the commentary (five of them in the comment upon this rule) they will be put together, and their bearing discussed, in an additional note at the end of the work For *çrñge*, *antarâ çrñge tam devatâh* (vi.2 8⁴ only G M have *devatâh*) the word also occurs at i 2 14⁷ The next two words, *ene* and *medhye*, occur in the same passage, *medhye evâi 'ne karoti* (vi 2 9¹), which the comment quotes, in W O giving *medhye* last, after the rest, by way of justifying the order in which the two words stand in the rule but B G M read the whole passage as it stands in the text, and G M make the rule read correspondingly *medhye ene* (T has, like the others, *ene medhye*) *Ene* is also found in one or

---

11 ------ *etâni padâni pragrahasamjñâni*[1] *syuh*[2] *yathâ dev----- achid----- bhâg----- bhâge*[3] *'ti kim agna----- ûr----- viç----- vî*[4] *'ti kim tas----- iti çâkhântare*[5] *ant----- ev----- me----- asam----- sam----- yad----- pâr----- pit----- vik----- ce 'ti kim sam----- tatho----- eve 'ti kim nâi----- pît----- yad----- samv----- sam----- vish----- vatsarasyaviviishv*[6] *iti kim arû---* [7]*rûpaçabdasya*

two other passages (iv 6 2[4] vi 2 9[1] again, 3 9[6]) For *trnne*, *asamtrnne hi hanû atho khalu* (vi 2 11[3] only G M have the last two words) For *trdye*, *samtrdye dhrtyâi* (vi 2 11[3]) For *kanînike*, *yad atirâtrâu kanînike agnishtomâu yat* (vii 2 9[1] W B O begin at *kan-*) the same word occurs twice more in the next division For *pârçve*, *pârçve parahsamânah* (vii 3 10[3]) it is found a second time in the same division For *çive*, *pitarah somyâsah çive no dyâvâprthivî* (iv 6 6[4] W B O begin at *çive*) For *co 'ttame*, *vikarnîm co 'ttame upa dadhâti* (v 3 7[3] only G M have the last two words) and, to show the necessity of the *ca*, *samvatsaram sampâdyo 'ttame mâsi* (vii 5 3[1]) For *evo 'ttare*, *tatho evo 'ttare nirvapet* (iii.4 9[7]) and, to show why *eva* had to be included in the rule, *nâi 'ti shodaçy uttare tena* (vii 1 4[3] only G M have *tena*) For *çipre*, *pîtvâ çipre avepayah* (i 4 30 W B O begin with *çipre*) For *rathamtare*, *yad brhadrathamtare anvarjeyuh* (vii 5 3[2] only G M have *yad*) the same compound occurs in several places elsewhere For *vatsarasya rûpe*, *samvatsarasya rûpe âpnuvanti* (vii 5 1[4]) For *virûpe*, *samanasâ virûpe dhâpayete* (iv 1 10[4], 6 5[2], 7 12[3]) For *vishurûpe*, *vishurûpe ahanî dyâur ivâ 'si* (iv 1 11[3] W B O stop with *ahanî*) The necessity of including in the rule, besides the *pada rûpe*, the words *vatsarasya*, *vishu* (of *vishu-rûpe*), and *vi* (of *vi-rûpe*) is proved by the citation of *arûkshitam drça â rûpe annam* (iv 3 13[2]), where *rûpe* is locative and the commentary adds the remark (wanting, however, in the South-Indian MSS), "the separate specification of the word *rûpa* is to be looked upon as for the sake of distinct enunciation" For *sadohavirdhâne*, *sadohavirdhâne eva sam minoti* (ii 5 5[5]) the compound occurs twice more, at vi 2 6[2], 5 1[5] To justify the inclusion of *sadah*, the commentator quotes *uparavâ havirdhâne khâyante* (vi 2 11[1]), but the case appears to him one not to be so easily disposed of, and he enters into an elaborate discussion of it, which I defer to the end of this note, in order not to interrupt the connection For *adhishavane*, *hanû adhishavane jihvâ* (vi 2 11[4]) it is also found in the preceding division of the same section, and at iv 7 8[1] The *adhi* is justified by reference to *savanesavane 'bhi grhnâti* (vi 4 11[4], 6 11[3]) For *ahorâtre*, *ahorâtre prâ 'viçan* (i 5 9[7]) the word occurs not infrequently elsewhere The passage *atirâtre paçukâmasya* (vi 6 11[4]) is given to account for the inclusion of *ahah*, this implies, of course, that the Tâittirîya *pada*-text treats the word as a separable compound, *ahah-râtre* For *dhrtavrate*, *dyâvâprthivî dhrtavrate âvinnâ devî* (i 8 12[2] G M omit the last

---

prativiçeshanam uccâranavispashtârtham[8] *drashtavyam*[7] *sad-* ---- *sada iti kim up-*---- *nanu padagrahaneshu padam gamyeta* (i 50) *iti sâmarthyâd* [9]*dhavirdhâne ity ekapadasyâi 'va kâryasiddhih sadahpadam vyartham mâi 'vam padagrahane sthalântare*[10] *bhinnarûpasya*[11] *sambhâvanâyâm*[9] *viçeshanam sârthakam bhavati*[12] *bhinnarûpatvâbhâve tu codyam etad bhavet*[13] *nanu tarhi devate iti padagrahanasya sthalântare*[14]

word), and, to account for the inclusion of *dhrta*, *yasya vrate pushtipatih* (iii 1 11³) For *stutaçastre*, *stutaçastre evâi 'tena duhe* (v 6 8⁶ G M omit the last word) it occurs again at vii 3 13 This time, resort is had to "another text" (*çâkhântaram*) for a passage to explain why the rule does not say simply *çastre* it is *ûrdhve çastre pratishthite* For *rksâme*, *rksâme vâi devebhyah* (vi 1 3¹) the word is found twice in this division, and also at vi 5 9², 6 7⁴ Here, again, a passage in "another text," *brahma sâme pratishthite* (G M omit the last word, and B O omit the *sâ* of *sâme*), is appealed to in justification of the *rk* For *akte*, *purûravâ ghrtenâ 'kte vrshanam dadhâthâm* (i 3 7¹ and [except *purûravâh*] vi 3 5³ W B O omit the first word, B also the last) For *arpite*, *dyâvâprthivî bhuvaneshv arpite* (iv 7 13² only G M have the first word) For *râivate*, *çâkvararâivate sâmanî* (i.8 13² and iv 4 2³) the same compound is found again at iv 3 2³ For *pûrte*, the different recensions give different examples W B O have *ishtâpûrte sañ srjethâm* (iv 7 13⁵), G M, *ishtâpûrte krnutât* (v 7 7²) I have noted no other cases for the treatment of the word in the *pada*-text see the note to iii 6 For *pratte*, *pratte kâmam annâdyam duhâte* (v 4 9³ G M omit the last word) For *vidhrte*, again, W B O have *vidhrte sarvatah* (vi 4 10³), and G M *tasmân nâsikayâ cakshushî vidhrte samânî* (ii 3 8²), and the *vi* is justified by an alleged citation from "another text," *agnidhrte* (G M, however, omitting the *agni*, thus leaving it to be understood that the simple word *dhrte* is found elsewhere not *pragraha*) For *anrte*, *satyânrte avapaçyan* (v 6 1¹) For *achidre*, *achidre bahule ubhe* (iv 1 3² only G M have *ubhe*), which answers also for *bahule* it is the only passage containing either word For *pûrvaje*, *pûrvaje pitarâ navyasîbhih* (iv 1 11⁴ W B O omit the last word) another passage beginning with the same word is the subject of rule 23 of this chapter Once more a word, *prathamaje*, is cited from "another text," in order to explain why the rule does not say simply *je* (since the *pada*-text writes *pûrva je*) For *krnudhvañ sadane*, finally, we have the sole passage in which it occurs, *gîrbhih krnudhvañ sadane rtasya* (iv 1 11⁴ G M omit *rtasya*), with the counter example *apâm tvâ sadane sâdayâmi* (iv 3 1 G M omit the last word), to show the necessity of *krnudhvam*

To return, now, to the long word *sadohavirdhâne* The objection is raised, that its part *sadah* is unnecessary, and that it would

---

soma---- iti bhinnarûpatvâd[15] *viçeshanena bhavitavyam tac ca nâ 'sti ucyate devate ity akhandapadasyai 'va kâryavidhânâd atra viçeshanam na yujyate akhandavidhânam*[16] *iti katham pratîyate te ity asya te mâ pâtam* (iv 42) *ity âdinâ prthakkaranâd iti brûmah nâi*[17] *'vam havirdhâne*[18] *ity asyâ*[19] *'khandatvadyotakam* [20] *kimcid apy*[21] *asti yena sadahpadavâiyarthyam âlambate*[22] *hanû---- adhî 'ti kim sav---- aho---- ahar iti kim ati---- dyâv----: dhrte 'ti kim yasya---- stu-*

have been sufficient to say *havirdhâne* simply, for rule i 50 teaches us that, in citations of *padas*, the cited *pada* alone is to be understood, not any collocation of words or letters phonetically equivalent with it and *havirdhâne* is here a single *pada* (the compound being divided *sadah-havirdhâne*, while its latter member, occurring by itself as a non-*pragraha*, is written *havih-dhâne*, and so is a congeries of two *padas*) It is replied not so, a distinctive addition is properly made to a cited *pada*, in case of its occurrence in a different form in another passage, though the objection would hold good, were it not for such occurrence in a different form But this explanation is not suffered to pass without challenge In that case, retorts the objector, a distinction ought to be added to *devate*, because it occurs elsewhere in a different form (made up of two independent words), as in *soma deva te matividah* (iii 2 5[2,3]), and no such addition is made The answer is, that no distinction need here be applied to *devate*, because its treatment is defined as of an undivided word and, if you ask how its indivisibility is established, we reply that rule 42, below, treats of *te* as a separate *pada* in the various situations in which it is *pragraha* [whence the inference is clear that it is here an inseparable part of the word *devate*], while there is nothing whatever to show in like manner the indivisibility of *havirdhâne*, and so to prove the addition of *sadah* superfluous The implication is, that if the *pada dhâne* happened to be described elsewhere as *pragraha* after certain other *padas*, of which *havih* was not one, then we could be sure that *havirdhâne* here meant a single undivided *pada*, and its mention by itself would be enough, while, as things are, one cannot be certain that its part *havih* is not, like the *vi* and *vishu* of *virûpe* and *vishurûpe*, a distinctive addition

अमीचक्षुषीकार्ष्णीदेवताफल्गुनीमुष्टीधीनाभीवपाश्र-
पणीअक्नीजन्मनीसुम्निनीसामनीविष्णावीरेक्षवीदर्वीद्या-
वापृथिवी ॥ १२ ॥

---- *stute 'ti kim ûrdh----- iti çâkhântare rks---- rg iti kim brah----- iti çâkhântare pur----- dyâv----- çâkv----- isht----- prat----- vidh----- vî 'ti kim agn- iti çâkhântare* [13]*saty----- ach- --- pûrv----- pûrve 'ti kim prath- iti çâkhântare* -[23] *gîr----- krnudhvam iti kim apâm* ----

[1] O *pragrhyas-* [2] G M *bhavanti* [3] G M *bhâgadhe* [4] G M *viçakhe* [5] G M *ram* [6] W O *vatsaraviv* [(7)] G M om [8] B *nam vi*, W O *-tha* [(9)] G M om [10] MSS *sthal-* [11] W *patvam* [12] B G M om [13] G M om [14] B *sthâl-* [15] W B O *abh-* [16] B O *nditavi* [17] W B O *mai* [18] W B O *sadoh* [19] W *asâ*, B *â*, O om [20] W B O ins *na* [21] W B O *tathâ* [22] B *-nibyate* O *-mbhyate*, G M *âpadyate* [(23)] B om

12 Also *amî cakshushî, kârshnî, devatâ phalgunî, mushtî, dhî, nâbhî, vapâçrapanî, ahanî, janmanî, sumninî, sâmanî, vâishnavî, âikshavî, darvî, dyâvâprthivî*

The illustrative passages cited under this rule are as follows For *amî*, according to W B O, *amî vâ idam abhûvan* (iii 3 7[1]), but according to G M, *amî tvâ jahati* (iii 2 11[3]) I have noted elsewhere only vi 1 5[4] For *cakshushî*, *cakshushî vâ ete yajñasya* (ii 6 2[1] et al G M omit *yajñasya*) the word occurs about a dozen times For *kârshnî*, *kârshnî upânahâv upa muñcate* (v 4 4[4], 6 6[1] G M omit the last two words) For *phalgunî*, *pitaro devatâ phalgunî nakshatram* (iv 4 10[1]) again in the next division of the same section To show the necessity of including *devatâ* in the rule, is given *yad dvitîyañ sâ phalgunî* (ii 1 2[2]) For *mushtî*, *mushtî karoti vâcam* (v 2 1[7] and vi 1 4[3] G M omit *vâcam*) For *dhî*, *pradhî tâv ukthyâ madhye* (vii 4 11[2] G M omit *madhye*) For *nâbhî*, *rajatanâbhî vâiçvadevâu* (v 5 24) For *vapâçrapanî*, *vapâçrapanî pra harati* (vi 3 9[6]) it occurs also in the fourth division of the same section As counter-example, to explain the presence of *vapâ* in the rule, is given, "from another text," the compound *paçuçrapanî* (or, as G M read, *bhasmaçrapanî*) our Sanhitâ has *paçuçrapanam* at iii 1 3[2] For *ahanî*, *ahanî dyâur iva 'si* (iv 1 11[3]) For *janmanî*, *ubhe ni pâsi janmanî* (i 4 22) For *sumninî*, *sumnâya sumninî* (i 1 13[3]) For *sâmanî*, *sâmanî pratishthityâi* (iv 4 2[3]) also at i 8 13[2] For *vâishnavî*, *valagahanâu vâishnavî brhann asi* (i 3 2[2] only G M have the last two words) For *âikshavî*, *âikshavî tiraçcî* (vi 2 1[5] twice) For *darvî*, *darvî çrînîsha âsani* (ii 2 12[7] and iv 4 4[6]) For *dyâvâprthivî*, *dyâvâprthivî eva svena* (ii 1 4[7]) the word is frequently found elsewhere The commentator gives us here also a counter-example, *mahî dyâuh prthivî ca nah* (iii 3 10[2] et al G M omit *ca nah*), as if the inclusion of *dyâvâ* required justification but, in ordinary Vedic usage (I have omitted to inform myself in season respecting that of the Taittirîya *pada*-text), *dyâvâprthivî* is inseparable, and therefore itself a single *pada*

पूर्वश्च ॥ १३ ॥

13 As also, the preceding word

That is to say (by the application of rule i 58), the word preceding the last one mentioned in the rule next above, or *dyâvâprthi-*

---

12 ------ [1] *etâni padâni pragrahasamjñâni syuh*[2] *yathâ*[3] *amî---- caksh---- kârsh---- pit---- devate 'ti kim yad---- mush---- pra---- raj---- vap---- vape 'ti kim paç---- iti çâkhântare ah---- ubhe---- sum---- sâm---- val---- âiksh---- dar---- dyâv---- dyâve 'ti kim mahî----*

[1] G M ins *iti* [2] G M O *bhavanti* [3] W B O om

vî The examples given are *yâvatî dyâvâprthivî mahitvâ* (iii 2 6[1]), and *âvinne dyâvâprthivî* (i 8 12[2] G M invert the order of the two citations) I have noted only two other cases of the application of the rule, at ii 2 12[6], 6 7[5]

न रुन्धे नित्यम् ॥ १४ ॥

14 But not *rundhe*, in any case

The case intended to be excluded is quoted by the commentator *paçûn evâ 'va rundhe dyâvâprthivî gacha svâhâ* (vi 4 1[3] W B O omit the first three words and the last) The specfication *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases,' is intended to exclude also the operation of any other rule under which *rundhe* might chance to fall for example, in *rundhe yadâ sahasram* (ii 1 5[2]), where, as preceding *yadâ*, it would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 38 of this chapter I have noted no other case

हरीसहुरीसहूतीकल्पयन्तीआपृषतीआहुती ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also *harî*, *sahurî*, *sahûtî*, *kalpayantî*, *â prshatî*, and *âhutî* are *pragraha*

The cited examples are as follows For *harî*, *harî te yuñjâ prshatî abhûtâm* (iv 6 9[4] G M omit the last two words) it occurs in toward a dozen other passages For *sahurî*, *sahurî saparyât* (iv 2 11[1]), and the counter-example, to show the necessity of the *sa*, *tam âhurî hvayante* (but O reads *tâm*, B *hvayate*, and G M *ahurî vâcayati*), claimed to be found "in another text" This would imply, of course, that the *pada*-text reads *sa-hurî*—as is in fact the case For *sahûtî*, *sahûtî vanatam girah* (ii 3 14[1]), and, as counter-example, for the same purpose as the last, *hûtî punar juhoti* (but G M read *manur* for *punar*), also from "another text" For *kalpayantî*, *adhvaram kalpayantî ûrdhvam yajñam* (i 2 13[2] G M omit the first word, and W B O the last) another case is found at vi 2 9[3] For *â prshatî*, the passage already quoted for *harî*, *yuñjâ prshatî abhûtâm* (iv 6 9[4]), and, to justify the *â*, the counter-example *prshatî sthûlaprshatî* (v 6 12) For *âhutî*, *purodâçam ete âhutî juhoti* (i 5 2[3 4] G M omit the first two words, W B O the last) nearly the same phrase occurs again at

---

13 *cakârenâ 'nvâdishtadyâvâprthivî ity asmât*[1] *pûrvo 'pî "kâra ekâro*[2] *vâ padântah pragraho bhavati yathâ yâv-.... âv-....*

[1] G M *etasmât* [2] G M put before *ikarah*

14 *rundhe ity antyasvaro*[1] *dyâvâprthivî ity etasmât pûrvo 'pi na pragraho bhavati paçûn.... nityaçabdah prâptyantaranishedhârthah rundhe.... vîdâdi*[2] (iv 38) *prâptih*

[1] W *antasv-*, B O *antah sv* [2] O *viddvârâv iti*

i 5 4[4] To account for the *â* in this word, G M simply cites *hutî* as found in "another text" but W B O give the phrase *hutî tasmâd evâh* (but W O read *hûtî*, and B *ddhatî* W also has *vivâ iti* instead of *evâ iti*)

पूर्वश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16 As also, the preceding word

Namely *ete*, occurring before *âhutî* in the passage already quoted *purodâçam ete âhutî* (i 5 2[3] W B O here omit the first word)

वाससीतपसीरोदसी ॥ १७ ॥

17 Also *vâsasî*, *tapasî*, and *rodasî*

The examples are *vâsasî iva vivasânâu* (i.5 10[1], the word is also found at i.8 18), *sâkshâd eva dîkshâtapasî ava rundhe* (vi 1 1[2] the compound occurs again in the same division only G M have the first two words), and *ime vâi rodasî tayoh* (v 1 5[4] G M have dropped out *vâi*) the word is not rarely met with elsewhere

परश्च ॥ १८ ॥

18 As also, the following word

The passage contemplated by the rule is, as cited in the comment, *anv indrañ rodasî vâvaçâne* (i 7 13[1]) there is, I believe, no other falling under it

---

15 ------ [1] *eteshv antyasvarah*[2] *pragrahah syât*[3] *harî---- sah---- se 'ti kim tam---- iti çâkhântare sah---- se 'ti kim hûtî---- iti çâkhântare adhv---- yuñjâ----* [4]*e 'ti*[4] *kim prsh---- puro---- e 'ti kim hutî---- iti çâkhântare*

[1] G M ins *ity* [2] B O *antyah sv-* [3] G M *bhavati* (4) G M *ûkarena*

16 *cakârânvâdeçâd*[1] *âhutî ity etasmât pûrva* [2]*îkâra ekâro vâ padântah*[2] *pragraho bhavati yathâ pur----*

[1] G M *-anvadishta* (2) G M om

17 [1]------ *ity etâni pragrahasamjñâni bhavanti*[1] *yathâ. vâs---- sâk---- ime----*

(1) G M *eshv antyasvarah pragraho bhavati*

18 *cakârânvâdishtarodasî*[1] *ity etasmât para* [2]*îkâra ekâro vâ padântah*[2] *pragraho bhavati yathâ anv----.*

[1] G M *-tad ró* (2) G M om.

व्यचस्वतीभरिष्यन्तीनःपृथिवी ॥ १९ ॥

19 Also *vyacasvatî*, *bharishyantî*, and *nah prthivî*

The examples are *vyacasvatî sam vasâthâm* (IV 1 3²), *agnim antar bharishyantî jyotishmantam* (IV 1 3² G alone has the last word), and *dyâvâ nah prthivî imañ sidhram* (IV 1 11⁴) The needed counter-example for the last is supplied by *rejate agne prthivî makhebhyah* (IV 1 11⁴)

येअप्रथेतामुर्वीतेअस्ययंक्रन्दसीछन्दस्वतीतेआचरन्तीअन्तरैतासु ॥ २० ॥

20 Also in the verses beginning *ye aprathetâm*, *urvî*, *te asya*, *yam krandasî*, *chandasvatî*, *te âcarantî*, and *antarâ*

The commentator cites only the beginning of each verse, as a word with *pragraha* final occurs at or near the beginning in every case Thus *ye aprathetâm amitebhih* (IV 7 15⁶ there are three other cases of *pragrahas* in the verse) with the counter-example *ye te panthânah* (VII 5,24), to show that *ye* alone would not have defined the verse, *urvî rodasî varivah* (IV 7 15⁶ G M omit the last word three cases, besides *rodasî*, already disposed of by rule 17), *te asya yoshane* (IV 1 8² one more case the *te* is therefore made no account of in rule 42, below) with the counter-example *te 'vardhanta svatavaso mahitvanâ* (IV 1 11³), to show the necessity of *asya*, *yam krandasî avasâ* (IV 1 8⁵ contains two other cases) and, as counter-example, for a like purpose, *yam agne prtsu martyam* (I 3 13²), *chandasvatî ushasâ* (IV 3 11¹ it contains seven cases), *te âcarantî* (IV 6 6² also seven cases) with *te no arvanto havanaçrutah* (I 7 8²) as counter-example, to prove that *te* alone would not be enough, and, finally, *antarâ mitrâvarunâ carantî* (V 1 11² with four cases)

नोपस्थे ॥ २१ ॥

21 But not *upasthe*

---

19 ------ [4]*eteshv*[1] *antyasvarah*[2] *padântah*[3] *pragraho bhavati yathâ vyac----- agn----- dyâvâ----*[4] *na iti kim rej-----*

[1] G *eshv* [2] B *tyah sv* [3] G om [(4)] M om

20 ------ *etâsv rkshv îkâra ekâro*[1] *vâ padântah pragraho bhavati yathâ ye---- aprathetâm iti kim ye te---- urvî---- te---- asye 'ti kim te 'v----- yam---- krandasî iti kim yam---- chand-----* *te â----- âcarantî iti kim te no---- ant-----*

[1] G M put before *ikâro*

That is to say, *upasthe* is exempted from the action of the preceding rule it occurs but once in the verses forming the subject of that rule, namely in *mâte 'va putram bibhrtâm upasthe* (in the verse beginning *te âcarantî*, iv 6 6[2] W B O give only the last two words) To show that *sthe* would not have sufficiently defined the exception (*upa-sthe*), the commentator quotes *ye pratishthe* (*prati-sthe*) *abhavatâm* (from the verse beginning with *urvî*, iv 7 15[6])

इरावतीप्रभृत्या दाधार् ॥ २२ ॥

22 Also in the passage beginning with *irâvatî* and ending with *dâdhâra*

The passage in question is found at i.2 13[2], and contains six *pragrahas*, whereof one, *rodasî*, needs no further provision than was made in rule 17, above, it also contains a word in *e*, *manave*, which is not *pragraha*, being excepted by rule 54 The commentator quotes its beginning, *irâvatî dhenumatî hi bhûtam*

पूर्वजेप्रभृत्यायम् ॥ २३ ॥

23 And in the passage beginning with *pûrvaje* and ending with *ayam*

Of this passage, found at ii 6 7[5], the commentator quotes the first four words In order to the better understanding of the following discussion, I set it down here in full, along with the word that precedes it *hvayate pûrvaje rtâvarî ity âha pûrvaje hy ete rtâvarî devî devaputre ity âha devî hy ete devaputre upahûto 'yam* It contains ten *pragraha* endings, of which, however, two (*pûrvaje*) fall under rule 11, above The word *â*, 'as far as,' in the rule, is declared here to exclude the two limiting words mentioned (com-

---

21 *etâsv rkshû 'pasthe ity antyasvarah*[1] *padântah*[2] *pragraho na bhavati yathâ mât-.... upe 'ti kim ye....*

[1] B O *antah sv* [2] G M om

22 *irâvatîprabhrtî 'râvatî iti*[1] *çabdam ârabhyâ " dâdhâra dâdhâraçabdaparyantam*[2] *îkâra ekâro vâ padântah pragraho bhavati yathâ irâ-....*

[1] G M om [2] W B O *paryantam*

23 *pûrvajeprabhrtyayamparyantam*[1] *îkâra ekâro vâ padântah pragraho bhavati yathâ*[2] *pûrv-.... ânpadam*[3] *maryâdâyâm vartate nanu pûrv-.... ity ârabhyâ 'yam.... ity etatparyantam sthalam*[4] *etatsûtravishayah*[5] *kim na syât ucyate bhavatpaksha upabandhântahpâtitvât*[6] *krnudhvañ sadane* (iv.11) *iti grahanasya*[7] *vâiyarthyam*[8] *syât · tan*[8] *mâ bhûd iti tasmâd*

pare Pânini ii 1 13)—an arbitrary restriction, directly opposed by the analogy of the preceding rule, intended, doubtless, to relieve the treatise of the reproach of declaring the word *pûrvaje* a *pragraha* by two separate rules, but this is a small gain, since the same word occurs a second time in the passage, and cannot there be reached by any such device

A protracted, not to say tedious, discussion now arises, respecting the sufficiency and propriety of the rule as stated The first objection is how do we know that the passage had in view by the rule is not that which begins with *pûrvaje pitarâ* (iv 1 11[4]) and ends with *ayam purobhuvah* (iv 3 2[1] B O omit *bhuvah*) Because, it is answered, the special citation (in rule 11) of *krnudhvañ sadane* (iv 1 11[4]), which occurs within the limits mentioned, would in that case be rendered superfluous Objection second the word *pûrvaje*, at any rate, is useless, it having been already made *pragraha* by rule 11, the rule should read "beginning with *varî*" (the concluding *pada* of the separable compound *rta-varî*) This, too, is repelled the rule reads as it stands because *varî* occurs twice in the passage, and the question would arise where the defined limit should be understood to be moreover, as we are taught (i 25) in case of doubt to take the nearest, we should have to assume as intended the latter of the two, as being nearer to the other specified limit in which case we should arrive at the untoward result that the *pragraha* character of the first *varî* would not be established at all But now the objector triumphantly retorts, that there are also two instances of *pûrvaje*, and a like doubt as in the supposition last made would arise as to the identity of the one cited, and a like untoward result as was pointed out in connection therewith Not so, is the defense *pûrvaje* is not desig-

---

etat[9] *sthalam etatsûtravishayo na bhavati nanv atra pûrvajegrahanam anarthakam pûrvajekrnudhvañsadane* (iv 11) *iti tatrâi 'vo 'ktatvât* [10]*kim tu*[10] *varîpi abhrty*[11] *etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam ne 'ti brûmah varîgrahanadvayasambhavât kutra vâ 'vadhiniyamatvena*[12] *svîkâra*[13] *iti samdehah syât kim ca âsannañ samdehe* (i,25) *iti vacanâd uttarâvadhisamnikrshto*[14] *dvitîyavarîçabda eva svîkartavyah tathâ sati pûrvavarîçabdasya* [15] *pragrahatvam na syât tac câ 'nishtam nanu bhavanmate 'pi pûrvajedvayasambhavât kutra vâ grahanam iti samdehah samânah kim ca yuktyuktam*[16] *anishtam ca*[17] *samânam*[18] *mâi 'vam pûrvaje iti padam atra kâryabhâktvena*[19] *no 'cyate* [20]*yena pâunaruktyam bhavet kim tu pûrvaç câ 'sâu jeçabdaç ca pûrvaje etatprabhrtî 'ty*[21] *upalakshakatveno*[22] *'cyate*[20] *nanu tarhy*[23] *upahûta iti padam atikramyâ 'yam ity avadhitvena kimartham*[24] *ucyate* [25]*upahûta iti padânâm bâhulye* [26] *'py âsannañ samdehe* (i 25) *iti vacanât prâthamikasyâi 'va grahanasiddhih*[27] *mâi 'vam*[25] *upahûta iti padagrahane*[28] *tatra*[29] *gâuravadoshah*

nated by the rule as a word possessing the defined quality—which would indeed be a superfluous repetition (in view of rule 11), but it means 'the former *je* of the two,' and is given merely as a convenient limit to count forward from! Again why, at the end of the passage, is *ayam* pitched upon as limit, to the neglect of *upahûtah*, for, though this word is found several times in the immediate sequel, yet, in virtue of the principle already appealed to, "in case of doubt, take the nearest" (i 25), its first occurrence would be distinctly enough the one intended This also is disallowed to quote the whole compound word *upahûtah* (*pada*-text, *upa-hûtah*) would be to incur the charge of excess, and as for *upa* by itself, the first member of the compound, though it be a *pada*, its *pada* quality is of secondary rank, while that of *ayam* is primary [the latter being a complete word, but the former only a somewhat artificially separated portion of such], hence, on the principle "where there is a primary, a secondary is not in place," it was proper to cite *ayam* The answer, however, suggests the further objection that, on the same principle, the first limit is unsuitable [*je* being also a fragment of a word, and its predecessor *hvayate* should have been taken instead] That cannot be made good, is the reply, for there a want of suitableness in the primary word suggested if you take the primary *hvayate*, then, on the supposition that the definition of limits is to be understood inclusively [*â* being susceptible of both an inclusive and an exclusive interpretation], this word [as it ends in *e*] will appear to be cited as a *pragraha* which is wrong And if you urge that rule 54 of the chapter annuls this false inference, we reply that, on the principle "not to touch filth is far better than to wash it off," it is better not

---

upe 'ty etâvanmâtrasyâ ''dibhûtasyâ[30] *'ngasya*[31] *padatvam gâunam ayam ity asya tu*[32] *mukhyam mukhye sambhavati na gaunam iti nyâyâd ayam iti yuktam grahanam nanv etenâi 'va nyâyenâ ''dyâvadher*[33] *anupapannatâ nâ 'yam pakshah mukhyasambhavâbhâvât*[34] *tathâ hi hvayata iti mukhye svîkrte 'bhividhinyâyena tasyâ 'pi grahanam*[35] *syât tac câ 'nishtam* *ate samânapade* (iv 54) *iti vacanâd etad*[36] *anishtam na*[37] *bhavatî 'ti*[38] *cet prakshâlanâd dhi pañkasya dûrâd asparçanam varam iti nyâyâd dhvayata ity uccârya tasya nishedhakathanâd api tadanuccâranam eva ramanîyam*[39] *iti mukhyasambhavâbhâvo 'vastha*[40] *eva tasmâd asmint sûtre 'nupapattileço nâ 'sti*

[1] W O *ti â ayam-*, B *-ti ayam* [2] B O G M om [3] G M ins *idam* [4] B O om [5] B O *sutr-*, G M *-yani* [6] W ins *purvaje* [7] W *pragrahasya* [(8)] W B O om [9] G M om [(10)] B om [11] W B *rtâvari-* [12] W *vidhi-*, G M *-dhitvena* [13] G M *svikriyata* [14] G M *uktâv* [15] G M ins *ca* [16] W O *yuktiyuktam*, G M *yad uktam* [17] G M om [18] B O *tulyam* [19] B O *-tve* [(20)] B om [21] G M om [22] G M *-kshanat-* [23] G M om [24] G M *kim* [(25)] B om [26] G M ins *iti* [27] G M *-dheh* [28] G M om *pada* [29] G M *sûtra* [30] W G M om [31] W *'nçabdasya*, G M *ingyanç-* [32] G M om [33] B O *-dyapadasya* [34] O G M *-khye s-* [35] G M *pragrahatvam* [36] G M *tad* [37] G M om [38] G M om *iti* [39] W *svar-*, B O *varam* [40] G M *tadav*

to quote *hvayate* at all than to quote it and then make it the subject of an exception The case, then, is one where no suitable primary word is to be found, and not the slightest charge of impropriety can be maintained against the rule as given

Both parties to this controversy are about equally open to the charge of hair-splitting absurdity, but the objector must be acknowledged to have the right of it so far as this—that the rule is really ambiguous, considering the presence of the two words *pûrvaye* That *pûrvaye*, as used in it, means 'the former *ye*,' I do not at all believe

इमे गर्भमुपैवरसेनपरः ॥ २४ ॥

24 Also *ime*, when followed by *garbham*, *upa*, and *eva rasena*

The passages referred to are *yad ime garbham adadhâtâm* (iii 4 3[2] G M omit the last word), *ime upâvartsyatah* (vi.1 3[1]), and *ime eva rasenâ 'nakti* (vi 3 11[3]) Two counter-examples are given one to show the necessity of *rasena* after *eva*, *ima evâ 'smâi lokâh* (ii.4 10[3]), and one to show in general the need of specifying the situations in which *ime* is *pragraha*, *adhvartavyâ vâ ime devâh* (iii.2 2[3])

क्रूरमापःसजूर्ब्रह्मजितेषु च ॥ २५ ॥

25 As also, in the sections beginning with *krûram*, *âpah*, *sajûh*, and *brahma ja*

That is to say, *ime* in the sections specified is always *pragraha*, even when otherwise followed than by the words mentioned in the preceding rule The commentator quotes the beginning words of each section, and a single example from each thus, from the section *krûram iva vâi* (v 1 5 only G M have the last two words), *rodasyor ity âhe 'me vâi rodasî* (v 1 5[4] the only case in the sec-

---

24 *ime ity antyasvaro garbhah upa eva rasena evamparah padântah*[1] *pragrahah syât yathâ yad---- ime---- ime ---- rasene 'ti kim ima---- evampara iti kim adhv-----*

[1] G M om

25 *ime iti caçabdo*[1] *'nvâdiçati krûram âpah sajûh brahma ja* [2]*eteshv anuvâkeshv ime ity antyasvarah pûrvoktaparanimittâbhâve*[3] *'pi pragraho bhavati krû---- ity atra yathâ*[4] *rod- ---- âpo---- ity atre 'me----*[2] *saj----- ity atra yathâ*[5] *etaça---- brah----- ity atra yathâ na---- je 'ti kim brah----- ity atra traya --- ity asya*[6] *pragrahatvam mâ bhûd iti*

[1] G M put before *ime* (2) W *jñâneshu* [3] G M om *para.* [4] B O om [5] B O G M om [6] B om, G M *atra.*

tion B O begin the citation at *ime*), from the section *âpo varunasya patnayah* (v 5 4 G M omit the last word), *ime evo 'pa dhatte* (v 5 4[1] there are two more cases in the following divisions), from the section *sajûr abdah* (v 6 4 G M omit the last word), *etaça ime açvinâ samvatsarah* (v 6 4[1] the only case only G M have the first word), from the section *brahma jajñânam* (v 2 7), *nâ hî 'me yajushâ "ptum arhati* (v 2 7[4] the only case B O omit the last word) The last calls for a counter-example, to show the need of including in the rule the syllable after *brahma* there is another section beginning *brahmavâdino vadanty adbhih* (ii 6 5 B O omit *adbhih*), which contains an *ime* not *pragraha* *traya ime lokâh* (ii 6 5[3] only G M have *trayah*)

पूर्णे च ॥ २६ ॥

26 As also *pûrne*

The *ca*, 'and,' in this rule merely brings down the heading of the last *anuvâka* named in the one preceding In that *anuvâka*, *pûrne* is *pragraha* to wit, in *pûrne upa dadhâti pûrne evâi 'nam* (v 2 7[4]), but not elsewhere, as for example in *yo vâi pûrna âsiñcati* (vii 5 6[1])

दृढे ॥ २७ ॥

27 Also *drdhe* is *pragraha*

The restrictions imposed in previous rules no longer hold good *drdhe* is *pragraha* wherever met with The example given is *yena dyâur ugrâ prthivî ca drdhe* (iv 1 8[5]) There is another case at iii 2 4[3]

घ्नीचक्रे पपरे ॥ २८ ॥

28 Also *ghnî* and *cakre*, when followed by *p*

---

26 *caçabdo brahmajajñânam ity anvâdiçati pûrne ity antyasvaro brahmajajñânam ity anuvâke pragraho bhavati yathâ*[1] *pûrne....* [2]*asminn anuvâka*[2] *iti kim yo....*

[1] B O G M om [(2)] B O *brahmaja*

27 *drdhe ity asminn*[1] *antyasvarah sarvatra*[2] *pragraho bhavati yathâ*[3] *yena....*

[1] B O om [2] B O om [3] B O G M om

28 *ghnî cakre ity*[1] *ete pade papare pragrahe*[2] *bhavatah vâr-.... cakre.... papare iti kim yad.... sam-.... ghnîcakre iti kim çak-.... ye-.... pakârah*[3] *paro yâbhyâm te papare*

[1] G M om [2] G M *-grhye* [3] W *pah*

The examples are *vârtraghnî pûrnamâse* (ii 5 2[5]), *cakre prshthâni* (vi 6 8[1]) I have noted no other cases We have then two pairs of counter-examples, to show that these words are *pragraha* before *p* only, and only these words before *p* the first pair are *yad virûpayâ vârtraghnî syât* (vi 1 6[7]) and *samidhâna cakre nîcâ tam* (i 2 14[2] only W has *tam*), the second, *çakâ bhâumî pântrah* (v 5 18) and *yeshâm îçe paçupatih* (iii.1 4[1 2])

न्वती ॥२९॥

29 Also *nvatî*

Two examples are cited *omanvatî te 'smin* (ii 6 9[5] G M omit the last two words), and *vrdhanvatî amâvâsyâyâm* (ii 5 2[5]) also a counter-example, proving that *vatî* alone would not have been sufficient *karnakâvaty etayâ* (v 4 7[3])

पपरो न ॥३०॥

30 But not when followed by *p*.

The case here excepted—the only one, so far as I have noticed—is *mûrdhanvatî puronuvâkyâ bhavati* (ii 6 2[2] G M omit the last word)

समीची ॥३१॥

31 *Samîcî* is *pragraha*

For this word, G M cite *samîcî retah siñcatah* (v 5 4[2]), B O cite *paçcât samîcî tâbhih* (v 2 3[5]), W gives both passages The word is met with a dozen times or more in the Sanhitâ

नपरो न ॥३२॥

---

29 *nvatî ity antyasvarah*[1] *pragraho bhavati yathâ*[2] *om-....* *vrdh-....* *nakârena kim karn-....*

[1] B *antah s-*, O *antas* [2] B O G M om

30 *sâmnidhyân nvatî iti*[1] [2]*labhyate. paparo nvatî ity*[2] *antyasvarah*[3] *pragraho na bhavati yathâ*[4] *mûr-....*

[1] O om [(2)] B om [3] B *antah s*, O *antas-* [4] B O G M om

31 *samîcî ity antyasvarah*[1] *pragraho bhavati yathâ*[2] *sam-.... paç-....*

[1] B *antas-*, O *antyah s* [2] B O G M om

32 *sâmnidhyât samîcî iti labhyate na khalu samîcî ity antyasvaro nakâraparah*[1] *pragraho bhavati yathâ*[2] *sam-....*

[1] G M om [2] W G M om

32 But not when followed by *n*

The case excepted is *samîcî nâmâ 'si* (v 5 10[1]) I have noted no other

चो यत्प्रपरः ॥ ३३ ॥

33 *Cî* is *pragraha*, when followed by *yat* or *pra*

The passages had in view by this rule are *dikshavî tiraçcî yad âçvavâlah* (vi.2 1[5] W O omit the first word, G M B the last, and B has the citation out of place, after the next but one), and *prâcî pretam adhvaram* (i 2 13[2] and vi 2 9[3]), besides two other cases before *pra* at vi 2 1[5], 3 9[6] The commentator gives in addition a number of counter-examples to show that *cî* is not always *pragraha*, *prâcî diçâm* (iv 3 3[1] et al but W B O read instead *yâ prâcî dik*, which is not to be found in the Sanhitâ *prâcî dik*, without *yâ*, occurs at several places, e g iv 3 6[2]), to prove the necessity of the *t* of *yat* and the *r* of *pra*, *gâur ghrtâcî yajño devân jigâti* (ii 5 7[4] only G M have the last two words) and *tasmât paçcât prâcî patny anv âste* (v 3 7[3] only G M have the first two words), to indicate that other endings than *cî* are not *pragraha* in the situations specified, *yad agnir vajra ekâdaçinî yad agnâu* (v 5 7[1] only G M have the first three words) and *prajanane prajananan hi vâi* (i.5 9[1] only G M have the last two words)

आन्मह्यौ ॥ ३४ ॥

34 Also *ân mahî*

The passage is *mahân mahî astabhâyat* (ii 3 14[6]) Elsewhere, *mahî* is not *pragraha* e g in *mahî dyâuh prthivî ca nah* (iii 3 10[2] et al G M omit the last two words), and even after *n* preceded by any other vowel than *â* e g in *vayunâvid eka in mahî devasyu* (i 2 13[1] and iv 1 1[1 2] G M omit the last word)

पत्नी श्रुतिः ॥ ३५ ॥

---

33 *cî ity antyasvaro yatparah praparo vâ pragrahah syât*[1] *yathâ*[2] *diksh-.... prâ-.... evamparа iti kim prâ-.... takârarephâbhyâm kim gâur-.... tas-.... cî 'ti kim yad-.... praj-....*

[1] G M *bhavati* [2] G M om

34 *ân ity etadviçishte mahîgrahane 'ntyasvarah pragrahah syât*[1] *yathâ mah-.... ân iti kim mahî-.... âkârena kim. vay-....*

[1] G M *bhavati*

35 Also the combination of sounds *patî*

The commentator explains wherever there is *çruti*, i e 'hearing,' of *patî*, there we are to understand a case of *pragraha*-quality Hitherto we have been dealing only with *padas*, or complete individual words, but the *î* of *patî* is uncombinable, even when that audible combination is only a part of a *pada* The selected examples are, first, *dvâu patî vindate* (vi 6 4[3]) and *çubhas patî idam aham* (iii 2 10[2] only G M have the last word), where *patî* is a *pada*, then *yam âçirâ dampatî vâmam açnutah* (iii 2 8[4] only G M have the first two words) and *priyam indrâbrhaspatî* (iii 3 11[1]), where it is part of a *pada* there are a few other cases

It is remarked at the end of the comment, that, from this rule on, parts of words are also subjects of prescription of *pragraha*-quality

ग्नी ॥ ३६ ॥

36 Also *gnî*

I have noted a number of cases of *gnî* as dual of *agnî* and its compounds The commentator gives two *antarâgnî paçûnâm* (i 6 7[1]), and *viçvâmitrajamadagnî vasishthena* (iii 1 7[3] and v 4 11[3])

न हिपरः ॥ ३७ ॥

37 But not when followed by *hi*

The case excepted is that of *gnî* occurring as nominative singular feminine of *âindrâgna* *âindragnî hi bârhaspatyâ* (v 5 6[2]) The commentator pleads the occurrence of *indragnî havâmahe* "in another text," as justification of the rule, in saying "by *hi*," instead of "by *h*" But we may question whether the justification is not officious and uncalled for

वीड्वारीकृष्णाश्वरावोयदापरः ॥ ३८ ॥

---

35 *patî ity asya yatra yatra çrutih*[1] *çravanam asti tatra tatra pragrahatvam vijñeyam yathâ dvâu____ çubh-____ çrutir iti kim yam____ priy-____ ity âdâv api*[2] *padâikadeçe pragrahatvâya*[3]

[1] G M om [2] G M om [3] G M *tvam*

36 *gnî iti pragraho bhavati*[1] *yathâ*[2] *ant-____ viçv-____*

[1] G M om [2] G M om

37 *gnî iti sâmnidhyâl labhyate na khalu gnî iti* [1] *padânto hiparah pragraho bhavati*[1] *yathâ âindr-____ evampara iti kim indr-____ iti çâkhântare*

[1] G M ins *api* [2] G M om

38 Also an *î* or *e* followed by *vîd*, *dvârâu*, *krshnah*, *carâvah*, and *yadâ*

The quoted passages under this rule have each its counter-example The first is *dhishane vîdû satî vîdayethâm* (i 4 1²), a double case, and, to show that *vî* alone would not have been enough, *âpaç ca me vîrudhaç ca me* (iv 7 5¹) Next, *devî dvârâu mâ mâ* (iii 2 4⁴), with *dvâdaça sam padyante dvâdaça* (i 5 7³), to prove the need of the *râu* of *dvârâu* Again, *yajñâyâ "tishthamâne krshno rûpam krtvâ* (vi 1 3¹ only G M have the first word, they also omit the last two words, while B O omit *krtvâ*), and *câtvâle krshnavishânâm prâ 'syati* (vi 1 3⁸ G M omit the last two words) justifies the *h* of *krshnah* Again, *vivasânâu ye carâvah* (i 5 10¹), with *râye ca nah svapatyâya deva* (v 5 4⁴ G M omit *deva*) to show that *ca* alone would not have been enough to prove that more than *car* or *carâ* is needed, the commentator does not attempt Finally, we have *ajanan nannamâne yade 'dam tâh* (iv 6 2⁴ only G M have *ajanan*) To this is raised the question whether *yatante*, as coming before *yad â-* in *çreniço yatante yad âkshishur divyam* (iv 6 7⁴ only G M have the first word), is not also *pragraha*? The answer is an appeal to rule i 50, "in citations of *padas*, a *pada* only is to be understood " but how we are to know that an integral *pada* is meant to be signified by *yadâ*, any more than by *vîd*, the commentator does not inform us

न ज्ञे ऽह्ने नित्यम् ॥ ३९ ॥

39 But not *jñe* and *ahne*, under any circumstances

The passages quoted in illustration of the rule are *varunâya râjñe krshnah* (v 5 11), and *vanaspatînâm enyahne krshnah* (v 5 15 only G M have the first word) these are both exceptions to the preceding rule, and are the immediate occasion of the

---

38 ------ [1]*ity evampara*[1] *îkâra ekâro vâ* [2] *pragraho bhavati*[3] *yathâ*[4] *dhish-----* *dakârena*[5] *kim âpaç-----* *devî-----* *râv iti kim dvâd-----* *yaj-----* *visargena kim cât-----* *viv------* *râva iti kim râye-----* *aj-----* *nanu*[6] *.çr e-----* *ity atra pragrahatvam kim na syât padagrahaneshu padam gamyeta* (i 50) *iti*[7] *vacanân na bhavati*[8] *'ti brûmah*

[1] G M *eshu pareshu* [2] G M ins *padântah* [3] G M om [4] W G M om [5] G M *vid iti* [6] G M om [7] G M *atra* [8] W *pravartate*, G M om

39 *jñe ahne ity*[1] *etayor antyasvaro nityam pragraho na syât yathâ var-----* *van-----* *vîdâdi* (iv 38) *prâptir anayoh nityaçabdah prâptyantarapratibandhakah*[2] *yathâ*[3] *yaj------* *gamayatobhavatah* (iv 52) *ity âdinâ prâptih sva------* *somâyasva* (iv 48) *iti prâptih*

[1] G M om [2] B O *pratishedh-*, G M *prâptyânishedhaprayojanakah* [3] G M om

introduction here of this one But the addition of *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases,' excepts the same words from the action of any other rule for example, of rules 52 and 48, which would otherwise apply in the passages *yajñe 'pi kartor iti tâv abrûtâm* (ii 6 7[1]) and *svarâjñe 'novâhâu* (v 6 21)

आकारैकारपूर्वस्तु बहुस्वरस्य ते थे ॥४०॥

40 *Te* and *the*, however, are *pragraha* in a word of more than two syllables, if preceded by *â* or *e*

The class of words here aimed at, of course, is composed of second and third persons plural of present and perfect tenses middle of verbs The commentator quotes several instances *etasmin vâ etâu mrjâte yo vidvishânayoh* (ii 2 6[1 2] only G M have the first three words, and they omit the last word), *çukrâ manthinâu grhyete* (vi 4 10[1]), *pra prthivyâ riricâthe divaç ca* (iv 2 11[1] only G M have the first and the last two words), and *drñhanâ yam nudethe* (iv 7 15[2]) Then, to justify the requirement of a preceding *â* or *e*, we have given us *â vrçcyate vâ etad yajamânah* (iii 3 8[1] G M omit the last word), of a polysyllabic word, *tat pravâte vi shajanti* (vi 4 7[2] see under i 48) and *yad ete grhyante* (iii 3 6[1]), the restriction to the endings *te* and *the*, *anûcyamâna â sâdayati* (ii 2 5[7],11[1])

As to the special significance of *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, two of our commentator's three chief authorities, Vararuci and Mâhisheya, are reported by him as at variance The former maintains that it indicates the cessation of regard had to the words specified in rule 38 as occasions of *pragraha*-quality, the latter, that it prescribes the annulment of continued implication of the exceptions mentioned in rule 39, and of what was there signified by the word *nityam* Vararuci's view is declared the better one, and with good reason—unless, indeed, we prefer to ascribe to the word a general change of subject, from mention of individual words to the description of a class

---

40 *bahusvarasya padasya sambandhî*[1] *te iti the iti vâ* [2] *"kârapûrva ekârapûrvo vâ pragraho bhavati yathâ et---- çuk---- pra---- drñh---- evampûrva iti kim â vrç---- trîni---- bahusvarasye 'ti kim tat---- yad---- tethe iti kim anûc---- vîdâdi* (iv 38) *nimittasâpekshatânivartakas tuçabda iti vararucipakshah mâhisheyapakshas tu vakshyate*[3] *pûrvasûtroktanishedhanityaçabdajñâpitânuvrttim*[4] *nivârayatî*[5] *'ti*[6] *tatra*[7] *vararucimatam ruciram bahavah svarâ yasmin tad bahusvaram tasya atra svaraçabdopâdânâc*[8] *ca*[9] *bahuçabdena vyaktibhedo vijñeyah*

[1] W *-dhiya* [2] G M ins *çabdah* [3] G M *ucyate* [4] G M *-dham nit* [5] G M *var* [6] G M om [7] G M *atra* [8] W *bahusvaraçabdopâdânatâ*, B O *bahu svararupaçabdena upadânatâ* [9] W B O om

The commentator's final remark as to *bahusvarasya* is obscure to me

न शार्याते ॥ ४१ ॥

41 But not *çâryâte*

Namely, in the passage *çâryâte apibah sutasya* (i 4 18 G M omit the last word) An exception to the preceding rule, by express mention of the excepted word

ते मापातंनमएनमभिवायुर्गर्भमुपाहस्तुपरः ॥ ४२ ॥

42 *Te* is *pragraha* when followed by *mâ pâtam*, *namah*, *enam abhi*, *vâyuh*, *garbham*, *upa*, *ahas*, and *tu*

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are *vâm â rabhe te mâ pâtam â 'sya* (i 2 2[1 2] only G M have the first three words), with *te mâ 'smin yajñe* (iii 2 4[1]), to show the necessity of including *pâtam* in the rule, *punas te namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhâya* (i 5 10[1] only G M have the last word), with *te na vy ajayanta* (v 4 1[1]), to prove that *na* alone would not have been enough, *te enam abhi sam anahyetâm* (ii 5 6[5]), with *ta enam bhishajyanti brahmanah* (ii 3 11[4] W omits the last word), to justify the inclusion of *abhi*, *te vâyur vy avât* (iii.4 3[1]), with *te vâcañ striyam* (vi 1 6[5]), to show why the *yuh* of *vâyuh* was needed, *te garbham adadhâtâm* (iii 4 3[1]), without any counter-example to prove that *ga* would not have answered the purpose, *te upâ 'mantrayanta* (vi 1 3[1]), *te ahorâtrayoh* (vi 1 3[1]), *te tv âva no 'tsrjye ity âhuh* (vii 5 7[1] G M omit the last two words), with *te te dhâmâny uçmasi* (i 3 6[1]), to show that *t* not followed by *u* is not enough to determine the *pragraha*-quality Then, as further counter-examples, we have *te devâh* (i 4 10[1] et al) in proof that *te* is not *pragraha* before other words than those here mentioned, and *brhad ukshe namah* (i 4 26), *amushmin loka upa çere* (v 3 7[2]), and *yanti*

---

41 *çâryâta ity antyasvarah*[1] *pragraho na*[2] *bhavati yathâ çâr-.... pûrvasûtraprâptâu*[3] *satyâm kanthoktanishedho*[4] *'nena*[5] *vidhîyate*

[1] B *yah s-* [2] O om [3] G M *-trena pr*, B *tre pr-* [4] G M *-ktyâ n* [5] G M om

42 [1]*...... evamparas te iti çabdah pragrahah syât yathâ*[2] *vâm.... pâtam iti kim te.... punas.... ma iti kim te .... te e-.... abhî 'ti kim ta.... te v-.... yur iti kim te v-.... te ga-.... te u-.... te ah-.... te tv.... ukârena kim te te.... evampara iti kim te d-.... te iti kim brh-.... am-... yanti....*

[1] W B O ins *te* [2] G M om

vâ ete savanâdye 'hah (vii 5 6³), showing that only *te* is *pragraha* in the situations defined

These are not all the instances found in the Sanhitâ of *te* as *pragraha*, one was disposed of by rule 20 above, and at least one or two others come under the action of other rules of this chapter

अनुदात्तो न नित्यम् ॥ ४३ ॥

43 But not when unaccented, under any circumstances

That is to say, even in such a situation as would bring it otherwise under the preceding rule The example quoted is *bâhubhyâm uta te namah* (iv 5 1¹) if the text contains others I have failed to notice them The specification *nityam* has its usual force, as suspending the application of all rules to the contrary, wherever found for example, that of rule 52, below, in the passage *namas te astv âyudhâya* (iv 5 1²)

एते तनुवौवैसमेवह्रियज्ञपदिष्टकपरः ॥ ४४ ॥

44 *Ete* is *pragraha* when followed by *tanuvâu vâi sam*, *eva*, *hi*, *yajña*, *pad*, and *ishtak*

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are *tasyâi 'te tanuvâu* (v 7 3³), *ete vâi samvatsarasya cakshushî* (ii 5 6¹ G M omit the last word), with *ete vâ idâyâi stanâh* (i 7 1² G M omit the last word) as counter-example, showing that before *vâi* not followed by *sam* the word is not *pragraha*, *sa ete eva namasyann upâ 'dhavat* (ii.5 6⁵ only G M have the first word, and they omit the last two), *ete hi devânâm* (ii 5 6⁶ another case at vii 5 7¹), *cakshushî vâ ete yajñasya* (ii 6 2¹ et al compare also the nearly identical passage vi 2 11³), *yajñasya hy ete pade atho* (v 1 6³ ⁴ W omits the first word), and *yad ete ishtake upadadhâti* (v 3 5²) Counter-examples would have been in place to show that, in citing the last three fragments of words, the rule had taken no more than just what was sufficient for its purpose, but

---

43 *mâ pâtam ityâdiparo 'pi te ity antyasvaro*[1] *'nudâtto nityam pragraho na bhavati yathâ*[2] *bâh-.... nityam iti kim lakshanântaraprâptasyâ 'pi pratishedho*[3] *yathâ syât na-.... gamayatobhavatah* (iv 52) *ity âdinâ*[4] *prâptih*

[1] O *-yah sv* [2] G M om [3] G M *nish* [4] O G M om, B *antya*

44 [1]*...... ity evampara ete ity antyasvarah*[2] *padântah*[3] *pragraho bhavati yathâ tas-... ete.... sam iti kim ete.... sa.... ete.... cak-.... yaj-.... yad.... *[4]*evampara iti kim atha.... ete iti kim man-.... push-.... agre.... sapt-....*[4]

[1] B O ins *ete* [2] O *-yah s* [3] G M om [4] W B O om

they are not furnished The general counter-examples under this rule, like those under the last but one, proving that only *ete* is *pragraha* before the words specified, and *ete* itself before them only, are given by G M, but omitted in the other manuscripts they are *atha katama ete devâ iti* (ii 6 9³), *manuta evâi 'nam etâni* (v 5 6¹), *pushkaraparne hy enam upaçritam* (v 1 4⁴ MSS *-çrutam*), *agre yajñapatim dhatta* (i 1 5¹), and *saptame pade juhoti* (vi 1 8¹)

परश्च द्वयोः ॥ ४५ ॥

45 As also, the letter following the two last mentioned

The "two" of the rule are *pad* and *ishtak*, and the commentator makes the further obvious specification that the letter following them is *pragraha* only when they themselves follow *ete*, as prescribed in the preceding rule He quotes the passages referred to *yajñasya hy ete pade atho* (v 1 6³ ⁴ W omits to *pade*, B O to *ete*), and *yad ete ishtake upadadhâti* (v 3 5²), adding, to show the necessity of the limitation made by him, the counter-examples *saptame pade juhoti* (vi 1 8¹), and *tasyâs te devî 'shtake* (iv 2 9²)

स्थःपरः ॥ ४६ ॥

46 Also one followed by *sthah*

There is a natural reason for this rule, *sthah* being a dual verb, and so, apt to be preceded by a dual noun I have noted near a dozen cases in the text, the one cited in illustration by the commentator is *vishnoh çnyaptre sthah* (i 2 13³) To show that *stha* instead of *sthah* would not answer, is given *etasmin loke stha yushmâñs te 'nu* (iii 2 5⁶ only G M have the first two words, and they omit the last three)

परश्चोभयोः ॥ ४७ ॥

47 As also, one following them both

Following, namely, a *sthah* and a preceding *pragraha* word for example, *çilpe sthas te vam â rabhe* (i 2 2¹ but this citation is wanting in G M), and *drdhe sthah çithire samîcî* (iii 2 4³) A counter-example, of a word following *sthah* only, is *vrshanâu stha urvacî* (i 3 7¹)

---

45 *nimittina upari vartamânayoh padishtakçabdayoh*[1] *para*[2] [3]*îkâra ekâro vâ*[3] *pragraho bhavati yathâ yaj-.... yad-.... nimittina upari vartamânayor iti kim sapt-.... tas-....*

[1] B O *dvayoh padishtak ity etayoç cakârânvâdishtayoh*, G M *pat ishtaka ity etayoh cakârânvadishtayoh dvayoh* [2] B O *parata* [(3)] G M om

46 *stha ity evampara îkâra ekâro vâ padântah pragraho bhavati yathâ vish-.... visargena kim et-....*

The commentator then proceeds to point out that the difference in phraseology between this rule and the last but one—*dvayoh*, 'two,' being used in the one, and *ubhayoh*, 'both,' in the other—indicates a difference of meaning Above, the two affecting causes (*nimitta*) specified in the preceding rule, each along with the word affected by it (*nimittin*), were intended, here, on the other hand, the two aimed at are an affecting and an affected word

सोमायस्वेतस्मिन् ॥ ४८ ॥

48 Also in the section beginning *somâya sva*

The section in question is v 6 21 it was necessary to add *sva*, in order to distinguish it from that beginning *somâya pitrmate* (i 8 5) It contains thirteen *pragrahas*, of which the commentator cites several together *avî dve dhenû bhâumî* (v 6 21[1] G M omit *bhâumî*) three of these, however, would be disposed of by the three rules next following

द्वे ॥ ४९ ॥

49 Also *dve*

This word, which occurs about forty times in the Tâittirîya text, is, of course, always *pragraha* The commentator cites two instances *dvedve sam bharati* (i.6 8[2]), and *yad dve naçyetâm* (ii 6 3[5])

परश्च ॥ ५० ॥

---

47 *cakârânvâdishtayoh pûrvasûtroktanimittanimittinor*[1] *ubhayoh para îkâra ekâro vâ padântah pragraho bhavati yathâ çil- .... drdhe- .... ubhayor iti kim vrsh- .... paraç ca dvayor* (iv 45) *iti* [2] *vâcya ubhayor iti çabdântaram*[3] *arthântarajñâpakam*[4] *nimittisahitayoh*[5] *pûrvasûtroktayor nimittayoh parah pragraho bhavati paraç ca dvayor* (iv 45) *iti sûtrârthah atra tu*[6] *sûtre nimittanimittinor*[7] *ubhayoh parah pragrahah syâd iti viçeshâd*[8] *bhedo vijñeyah*[9]

[1] G M *purvokta* ° B ins *kim ca*, O ins *ca* [3] G M *-taraprayogah* [4] G M *kah* [5] G M *-ttas-* [6] G M om [7] G M *ttinimittayoh* [8] B *-shana*, O *-shena*, G M *vishaya* [9] G M *drashtavyah*

48 *somâya svarâjñe* (v 6 21) *ity asminn anuvâka îkâra ekâro vâ padântah pragraho bhavati yathâ avî- .... ity âdi sve 'ti kim somâya pitrmate* (i 8 5) *ity atra mâ bhûd iti*

49 *dve ity antyasvarah padântah*[1] *sarvatra pragraho bhavati*[2] *yathâ*[3] *dve- .... yad- ....*

[1] G M om [2] G M om [3] G M O om

50 As also, the following word.

The comment instances but one case, a double one *dve çukle dve krshne mûrdhanvatîh* (v 3 1⁴ G M omit the last word) Of such the text contains more than a dozen, but they are not worth referring to in detail

एकव्यवेतोऽपि ॥५१॥

51 Likewise the next but one

The *api*, 'likewise,' in this rule is explained as bringing forward *dve* from the last rule but one, another application of the "principle of the frog's leap" The cited examples are *dve hy ete devate* (ii 1 9³ but G M omit this citation), and *dve vâva devasatre* (vii 4 5¹) By rule i 48, *devasatre*, though a divisible compound (*pada*-text, *devasatre iti deva-satre*), is reckoned as but a single *pada* for the purposes of this precept another like case, *dve savane çukravatî* (vi 1 6⁴), was expressly quoted as an illustration under the former rule At vi.6 4³ (*dve jâye vindate*) is a case where the action of the rule is suspended by a later one, iv 54

गमयतोभवतोऽनूकारात्परंतनूयदकरोत्कुर्यादिष्टिष्वब्रूतांप्रवर्तास्तांस्तभ्नीतांवाचयतिबिभृतस्ताग्निंगायत्रंताभ्यामेवोभाभ्यामवान्तरंपर आ षष्ठात् ॥५२॥

52 Before, and within six words of, *gamayatah*, *bhavatah* (except when it follows *û*), *tanû yat*, *akarot*, *kuryât* (in *ishti* passages), *abrûtâm*, *pra varta*, *âstâm*, *stabhnîtâm*, *vâcayati*, *bibhrtas ta*, *agnim gâyatram*, *tâbhyâm eva*, *ubhâbhyâm*, and *avântaram*

Of the words here specified, some are duals, and so would naturally have other duals, with *pragraha* endings, in their vicinity, in other cases, the collocation is purely accidental

The *â* in the rule is declared to be intended this time "inclusively" (*tena saha*, 'along with the specified limit' compare the scholiast to Pânini ii 1 13), and the necessity of the specification

---

50 *cakâro dve ity anvâdiçati dve ity etasmât*[1] *para îkâra ekâro vâ padântah pragraho bhavati*[2] *yathâ*[3] *dve*----

[1] O *asmât* [2] B O *syât*, G M om [3] G M om

51 *ekavyaveto*[1] *'pi dve ity etasmât para îkâra ekâro vâ padântah pragraho bhavati*[2] *yathâ*[3] *dve*---- *dve*---- *ekena padena*[4] *vyaveta*[5] *ekavyavetah apiçabdo dve ity anvâdiçati mandûkaplutinyâyena*

[1] B O *vahito* [2] G M om [3] G M om [4] G M om [5] W *vyavahita*

"within six words" is explained as arising from rule i 30, which would limit the meaning of "before" to 'the word standing next before' This involves a misinterpretation of the rule referred to, which was made for quite another purpose (see the note upon it) No such special and technical ground is needed to justify the terms of the present rule, which are of obvious and incontestable propriety

The commentator's example for *gamayatah* is *te evâi 'nam pratishthâm gamayatah* (ii 1 4^{7}) I have noted no other case For *bhavatah*, he gives *uttarâvatî bhavatah* (v 4 8^{5}), with the counter-example *dîkshante 'ntanâmânâv rtû bhavatah* (vii 4 8^{1}), to show the necessity of the restriction imposed by the rule in the case of this word There are quite a number of other passages where *bhavatah* assures the *pragraha*-quality to words in its neighborhood I have noted ii 2 2^{3},$11^{4\ 5}$, 3 2^{9},3^{5},$4^{3,4}$,8^{2} iii 1 7^{2},9^{3}, 5 4^{4}, v 4 6^{3}, 5 1^{2} vii 1 4^{3}, 2 1^{3} twice With regard to the limitation *anûkârât*, the commentator remarks that although simple absence is the primary significance of its negative prefix, yet another meaning is here assumed, in accordance with the requirements of the case that is to say, "after a not-*û*" is to be understood as 'after any letter but *û*' For *tanû yat*, we have *ete vâi mahâyajñasyâ 'ntye tanû yat* (ii 2 7^{5} I have found no other case), and, as counter-example, to justify the inclusion of *yat*, *paripataye tvâ grhnâmi tanûnaptre tvâ* (i 2 10^{2} only W has the last word) For *akarot*, *budhnavatî agravatî yâjyânuvâkye akarot* (ii 3 4^{3} another case at ii 2 8^{5}) For *kuryât*, *mânavî rcâu dhâyye kuryât* (ii 2 10^{2} another case at ii 3 3^{5}), with the counter-example *agnaye dâtre purodâçam ashtâkapâlam kuryât* (ii 5 5^{2}), to explain the restriction to *ishti*-passages The *ishtis* are defined as being "the three *praçnas* beginning with the tenth, but excepting their final *anuvâkas*" (which have before received the designation *yâjyâ*) that is to say, ii 2 1–11, 3 1–13, 4 1–13 There are other passages besides the one quoted proving the necessity of the restriction in question thus v 4 7^{7} vii 5 5^{1} For *abrûtâm* is cited *te abrûtâm varam vrnâvahâi* (ii.5 2^{5},6^{5} another case at v 2 3^{3}) For *pravarta*, *havirdhâne prâcî pravartayeyuh* (iii 1 3^{1}), with the counter-

52 *gamayatah bhavato 'nûkârât ûkâravyatiriktavarnât param bhavata iti* [1] *yady apy abhâvo mukhyârthas tathâ 'pi tadanyârthatâ*[2] *svîkrtâ*[3] *lakshyânusârât tanû yat akarot kuryâd ishtishu ishtayo* [4] *daçamâdayas trayah praçnâ uttamânuvâkavarjitâh*[5] *abrûtâm -----* *ity evampara â shashthât padât pûrvo vartamâna îkâra ekâro vâ padântah pragraho bhavati*[6] *abhividhâv ayam âkârah tena sahe 'ty abhividhih yathâ te---- utt----- anûkârât param iti kim dîksh----- ete---- yad iti kim pari---- budh----- mân----- ishtishv iti kim agn----- te---- hav----- varte 'ti kim te---- ime---- vâiç----- utt----- te---- te*[7] *'ti kim manm----- ete---- gâya-*

example *te 'dityâñ sam adhriyanta tvayâ pra jânâme 'ti* (vi 1 5[1] G M end at *pra*), to show why *varta* was added to *pra* For *âstâm*, *ime vâi sahâ "stâm* (iii 4 3[1] another case at iv 3 10[2]) For *stabhnîtâm*, *vâiçvadevâgnimârute ukthe avyathayantî stabhnîtâm* (iv 4 2[3]) For *vâcayati*, *uttame âudumbarî vâcayati* (v 1 10[2 3]) For *bibhrtas ta*, *te eva yajamânasya reto bibhrtas tasmât* (v 6 8[4]), with the counter-example *manmahe yâv âtmanvad bibhrto yâu* (iv 7 15[3]), to show that *bibhrtah* alone would not have answered the purpose of the rule Doubtless the single case is provided for in this rule rather than in 42, above, because there are cases of *ta eva* in the Sanhitâ which it would have made trouble to distinguish properly from this one For *agnim gâyatram*, *ete dadhâte ye agnim gâyatram* (vi 3 5[3]), with the counter-example *sadhasthe 'gnim purîshyam* (iv 1 3[1]), to show that the addition of *gâyatram* was needful For *tâbhyâm eva*, *ete vâi yajñasyâ 'ñjasâyanî srutî tâbhyâm eva* (vii 2 1[2], 3 5[3],7[3],9[3], 4 1[3],2[4],4[3]) With reference to this passage, the commentator raises the difficulty that *ete*, one of the words intended to be determined as *pragraha*, is not within six words of *eva*, one of the two words specified in the rule as conditioning its *pragraha*-character within that distance, but he declares it of no account, since what is within reach of any part of the assigned cause (*nimitta*) is within reach of that cause in its entirety For, he says, in common life also, a quality belonging to a part is ascribed to the whole which contains that part for example, people say "Devadatta has an ear-ring," when it is really his ear that has the ring Truly a most lucid and convincing illustration! The necessity of the *eva* is proved by the counter-example *apâ hañsy agne tâbhyâm putena* (iv 7 13[1] G M omit the last word) For *ubhâbhyâm*, *ye dve ahor âtre eva te ubhâbhyâm* (vii 4 4[4]) Finally, for *avântaram*, *utsrjye ity âhur ye avântaram* (vii 5 7[1]), with the counter-example *sam te 'va te hedah* (ii 5 12[1]), to prove that *ava* would not have been enough alone

न ग्रामीवर्चसीमिथुनीमासेलोकेधत्ते ॥५३॥

53 But not *grâmî*, *varcasî*, *mithunî*, *mâse*, *loke*, *dhatte*

---

tram iti kim sadh-.... ete.... atra padadvayam ekam[8] nimittam ity[9] etepadam[10] uddiçyâ "shashthaniyamabhañgaprasañga iti cet [11]nâ 'yam bhañgaprasañgah[11] nimittâikadeçâsya shashthatvopapatteh sakalasyâ 'pi nimittasya[12] shashthatvam upapadyate loke 'py avayavadharmenâ 'vayavino 'pi[13] viçeshasiddheh tathâ hi karne kundalam dhârayantam kundalî devadatta iti vadanti eve 'ti kim apa.... ye.... ut-.... antaram iti kim sam.... â shashthâd iti kim para ity uttarah (i 30) *iti paribhâshayâ 'nantarasyâi 'va paratvam syât tan mâ bhûd iti*

[1] G M ins *padam naño* [2] G M *tâm* [3] G M *kârya* [4] G M ins *nâma* [5] G M *-karahitah* [6] G M om [7] W B O *ste* [8] G M *etan* [9] O *eve 'ty* [10] O *etat p-* [(11)] B O *mâi 'vam pras-*. G M om *bhanga* [12] W O *-syâ 'pi*

These are words which, occurring within six of those mentioned in the last rule, would be *pragrahya* if not thus specially excepted The commentator quotes the passages in which they occur, as follows *grâmy eva bhavati ganavatî yâjyânuvâkye bhavatah* (ii 3 3^{5} another nearly identical case is found at ii 2 11^{4}) *brahmavarcasy eva bhavaty ubhayato rukmâu bhavatah* (ii 3 2^{3}), *atha mithunî bhavatah* (vi 5 8^{6}), *pûrnamâse prâ yachat tâv abrûtâm* (ii 5 2^{3}), *loke pratitishthanto yanti dvâu shadahâu bhavatah* (vii 4 11^{3}), and *dhatte jyotishmantâv asmâ imâu lokâu bhavatah* (ii 6 2^{4})

अते समानपदे नित्यमवे चावे च ॥५४॥

54 Nor *ate*, in a single word, nor *ave*, under any circum stances

After paraphrasing the rule, in a way which shows that he regards the specifications "in a single word" and "under any circumstances" as both alike referring to each of the "parts of words" mentioned, the commentator proceeds to cite illustrative passages, as follows *ava rundhate 'tirâtrâv abhito bhavatah* (vii 2 6^{3}, 4 1^{3}, 2^{5},3^{6} another nearly identical case is found at vii 4 5^{1}), *abhyâhvayate vajram enam abhi pra vartayati* (iii 2 9^{1} ^{7}), and *anâtatâya dhrshnave ubhâbhyâm uta te namah* (iv 5 1^{4} B O omit the last word, and G M the last two) To show the necessity of specifying that *ate* should form part of a single word, he quotes *eva te ubhâbhyâm* (vii 4 4^{3}) The limitation *nityam*, 'under any circumstances,' is explained in the usual manner, as intended to exclude the operation of other rules besides the one (iv 52) here especially aimed at for the appropriate examples we are referred to the comment upon rule i.59, where they are given in connection with the illustration of another point

---

53 ------ *eteshv*[1] *antyasvaro gamayato bhavata ityâdiparo 'pi pragraho na bhavati yathâ*[2]. *grâ ---- brah---- atha---- pûr---- loke---- dhatte----*

[1] G M *eshv* [2] G M om

54 *nishedham cakâro 'nvâdiçati ate ave ity anayoh padâikadeçayor antyasvarah samânapade vartamâno gamayato bhavata ityâdiparo 'pi nityam pragraho na bhavati yathâ*[1] *ava ---- abhy---- anâ---- samânapada iti kim eva---- atra nityaçabdah prâptyantaraparihârârthah udâharanam*[2] *upabandhas tu deçâya* (i 59) *iti sûtre*[3] *prasañgâd uktam samânam ca tat padam ca samânapadam tasmint samânapade*[4]

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
caturtho 'dhyâyah

[1] O om [2] G M *iti soda* [3] W *sutrena* [4] G M om.

This finishes the rehearsal of the words with *pragraha*-endings contained in the Sanhitâ As to the economy of the method of their rehearsal—whether it would have been possible to state the facts in fewer or briefer rules—I cannot speak with confidence it would be, certainly, a thankless task to endeavor to recast them in an improved form Nor can I, without a *pada*-manuscript, or a much more thorough and detailed study of the text, with the aid of a commentary, than it has been in my power to make, judge absolutely the success of the method followed It appears, however (with exception of the equivocal treatment of the words in *o*, pointed out under rule 7), to be complete my excerption of the text has shown me no *pragraha*-endings in *î* and *e* which are not duly taken account of, nor any case of final *î* or *e* not *pragraha* as involved in the general rules of the chapter without being duly excepted by special precept One or two words whose endings are treated as uncombinable without being *pragraha* are disposed of in another chapter (x 18)

CHAPTER V

CONTENTS 1–2, introductory, relation of *pada* and *samhita* texts, 3, order of application of rules, 4–8, anomalous insertions of a sibilant and *d*, 9–10, anomalous conversions of *r* and *h*, 11–19, anomalous omissions of *v*, *s*, *h*, *m*, and *ya*, 20–24, treatment of final *n* and *t* before palatal letters, 25–26, before *l*, 27–31, of final *m* before a consonant, 32–33, of final *n*, *t*, *n* before sibilants, 34–37, of initial *ç* after consonants, 38–41, of initial *h* after consonants

अथ संहितायामेकप्राणभावे ॥ १ ॥

1 The following rules apply in combined text (*samhitâ*), within the compass of a single breath

This is an introductory heading to the main part of the Prâtiçâkhya—the rules for the construction of the euphonically combined text (*samhitâ*) from its presupposed material, the *pada*-text, where

---

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah samhitâyâm ekaprânabhâva ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah samhite 'ti ko 'rthah nânâpadasamdhânasamyogah*[1] (xxiv 3) *iti* [2]*sûtreno 'ktah*[2] *samhitârthah*[3] *parah samnikarshah samhite 'ti vâiyâkaranâh*[4] *pathanti*[5] *ekasamutthah prâna ekaprânah tasya bhâvas tadbhâvah*[6] *tasmin ity âtreyamatam anyathâ 'pi samâsah samgachate ekaprânena bhâvyate janyata uccâryata ity ekaprânabhâvah ekeno 'chvâsena yâvân uccâryate vedabhâgas tâvân ekaprânabhâva ity arthah ata evâ 'vasâne padavi-*

each word stands separate, as if occurring independently It is a rule of far-reaching force, applying through many chapters (for an attempt to define precisely how far, see the comment to xxiv 2) The matters treated in the first two chapters—the mode of utterance of elementary sounds, definitions, general explanatory precepts, and the like—were with propriety first disposed of, the separate rehearsal of the *pragraha* endings, made in chapter iv, is more questionable, but defensible on the ground that those endings exhibit their *pragraha* character also in the *pada*-text, before *iti* but the exclusion of the vowels irregularly protracted in *samhitâ*, as rehearsed in the third chapter, is quite anomalous (see note to iii 1)

The commentator defines *samhitâ* by quoting a later rule (xxiv 3), which declares it to be "the union of separate words in euphonic combination," referring at the same time to the rule of Panini (i 4 109), as the account of it given by "the grammarians" For *ekaprânabhâve* he first gives us Âtreya's simple paraphrase, but then goes on to explain it more fully, as 'that which is brought about, generated, uttered, with a single breath, such portion of the Veda, namely, as is uttered by the help of one expiration'—the condition of *pada*, or separated and euphonically independent words, recurring with the pause that follows the expiration That is to say, if the repeater of the text has to pause to take breath where there is no regular *avasâna*, or pause of interpunction (such as separates the *pâdas* of a verse its length is taught in rule xxii 13), his last word is thrown out of *sandhi* with the next, and the end of the one and the beginning of the other must assume their *pada* form

Now is interposed an objection of what use are the two specifications "in combined text" and "within the compass of a single breath?" the former is enough by itself To this it is replied if the latter specification were not made, then no pause after a *pada* would be authorized in the continuous *samhitâ* arrangement and if the other were not made, then that respecting the single breath would apply also to the *padas*, hence doubt would arise as to where any direction to be given would have force there is, therefore, good reason for the double specification

---

dhih nanu samhitâyâm ity etâvatâi 'vâ[7] *'lam ekaprânabhâva iti vâ ubhayârambhanena*[8] *kim ucyate*[9] *ekaprânabhâva ity anârabhyamâne pravṛttasya samhitâvidheh padâvasânatvam ne 'shyate samhitâyâm ity anârabhyamâne tu padeshv apy ekaprânabhâva upapadyata iti*[10] *vakshyamânam*[11] *kâryam kva*[12] *bhavatî 'ti samdehah syât tasmâd*[13] *asminn*[14] *ubhayârambhane*[15] *prayojanam asti*

[1] B O *-nayoga* (2) G M *sûtrokta* [3] G M *samhite 'ty ar-* [4] W B G *vâyyâ-* [5] G M *bhananti* [6] W om [7] B O om *eva* [8] B O *bhena*, G M *-bhane* [9] G M om [10] G M om [11] B G M *na* [12] B O G M *kutra vâ* [13] G M *tadâ* [14] G M *tas-* [15] O G M *-bhe*, W B. *-bhena*

यथायुक्ताद्विधिः सा प्रकृतिः ॥ २ ॥

2 Separation from the text as combined—that is the fundamental text

I cannot but believe the intent of this precept to be the same with that of the rule which begins the second chapter of the Rik Pr, *samhitâ padaprakrtih*, 'the *pada*-text is the foundation of the *samhitâ*' but such intent is not readily and distinctly deducible either from the rule itself or from its commentary The latter explains that hereby is taught the *prakrti*, or proper form, of *samhitâ*, the reason being that a later rule (xxiv 5) prescribes as necessary to be understood, among other things, "*prakrti, vikrama, krama*" An arrangement which does not deviate from the *pada*-text as constituted, taken as supreme, that is to be regarded as the fundamental text By way of illustration is then quoted the whole series of passages falling under the action of rule x 13, below, passages in which the fundamental or *pada* form of certain words is maintained, against the ordinary rules of euphonic combination they are *svadhâ asy urvî câ 'si* (i 1 9³), *dhanvann iva prapâ asi* (ii 5 12⁴), *sahasrasya pramâ asi* (iv 4 11³ G M put this citation before the preceding one), *pra budhniyâ îrate* (iv 3 13⁶), *jyâ iyañ samane* (iv 6 6²), *â pûshâ etu* (ii 4 5¹ W B O omit this), and *aminanta evâih* (iii 1 11⁵) No explanation is attempted of the bearing of these examples upon the principle which is laid down in the rule now in hand we may suppose it to be that, the application of the rules of *sandhi* being denied in the case of these particular words, they remain in *samhitâ* in their regular or natural shape as shown in *pada*-text—*prakrtyâ*, as it is elsewhere termed And in this office of the precept is to be seen the real ground of its statement, rather than in a provision against the requirements of xxiv 5

The grand difficulty in this exposition lies in its quiet postulation of *avicalitah*, 'unremoved, not deviating,' as connective between *vidhih* and *yathâyuktât* I would sooner recur to the etymologic meaning of *vidhi*, 'dis-posal, putting apart,' and empha-

---

2 *prakrtih samhitâsvarûpam aneno 'cyate prakrtir vikramah kramah* (xxiv 5) *iti vijñeyatvavidhânât*[1] *yathâyuktâd yathâsthitât*[2] *padapâthât kûtasthâd avicalito*[3] *yo vidhih sa prakrtisamhitâ*[4] *vijñeyâ vidhir vidhânam prakrtir ity arthah yathâ*[5] *sva-- -- dhan---- sah---- pra--- jyâ---- â pû----- ami----- atra sûtre padânâm parasparânvayo mahâbhâshyavâcanâc*[6] *ca*[7] *vijñeyah tac ca vacanam tâ varnaprakrtayah* (ii 7) *ity atra pathanti*[8] *evam atrâ*[9] *'pi svaritayor madhye yatra nîcam* (xix 1) *ity âdâu mantavyam*

[1] W *rijñeyatvavidhât*, B *-tvena vi-*, G M *jñeyatvena vi-* [2] G M *-thâvas* [3] G M *câline* [4] W B O *-tih s* [5] G M om [6] G M *canena* [7] G M om [8] O G M *pathitam* [9] G M *anyatrâ*

size its prefix *vi* sufficiently to make it take an ablative adjunct, meaning 'separation from [the state] as combined,' and I have so translated above, though far from being confident that I have found the true solution of the difficulty. Neither *vidhi* nor its synonym *vidhâna* occurs elsewhere in the text, although both are frequent in the commentary (see Index), usually with the meaning 'rule, prescription,' not infrequently also 'arrangement, disposal.'

The commentator concerns himself finally with the gender of *sâ*, which, he says, comes under the rule already once quoted from the Mahâbhâshya in explanation of a like case (under ii 7), and he points out further that the same principle applies elsewhere—for example, in xix 1.

तत्र पूर्वंपूर्वं प्रथमम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. And here, that which comes first is first taken.

That is to say, in the construction of the *samhitâ* text, both the words to be treated and the rules to be applied must be taken up in their order, as they stand in the text and in the Prâtiçâkhya respectively. A variety of instances are given to illustrate the working of the principle. First, in *bhaksha â ihi* (iii 2 5[1]), the first two words are first combined, according to x 2, and then their result, *bhakshâ*, is combined with *ihi*, by x 4, making *bhakshe " 'hi*, the true reading, whereas, if the second combination had been first made, forming *e 'hi*, this would have coalesced with *bhaksha* into *bhakshâi 'hi*—which (though in itself, as may well be claimed, the preferable reading) is unauthorized and incorrect. This exemplifies the application of the rule to the order in which words are to be treated; for its application to the use of rules there are three examples. The first concerns the production of the *samhitâ*-reading *shannavatyâi* (vii 2 15) from the *pada* reading *shat-navatyâi*: it is accomplished by the successive application of vii 2, which prescribes the conversion of *n* to *n* after *shat*, and of viii 2,

3. *tatra samhitâvidhâne pûrvampûrvam padam sûtram ca prathamam kartavyam. yathâ bhaksha â ihi ity atra dîrgham samânâkshare* (x 2) *iti dîrghah*[1] *bhakshâ ihi iti sthita ivarnapara ekâram* (x 4) *ity ekâre krte bhakshe " 'hî 'ti bhavati. anyathâi 'hî 'ti krtvâ bhakshaçabde samdhîyamâne bhakshâi 'hî 'ti syât. tac câ 'nishtam. pûrvapadakartavyatva etad udâharanam. pûrvasûtrakartavyatve 'pi*[3] *vadâmah. yathâ*[4] *shattrigrâmanishpûrvah* (vii 2) *iti nakârasya natve krta uttamapara uttamam savargîyam* (viii 2) *ity anena*[5] *takârasya natve krte*[6] *shannavatyâ iti bhavati. anyatho 'ttamapara uttamam* (viii 2) *iti sûtre prathamam*[7] *pravrtte sati*[8] *shannavatyâ iti syât. tac câ 'nishtam. tathâ*[9] *vatth*[10] *svayamabhigûrtâye 'ty atra tanakârapûrvaç ca takârah* (v 33).

which changes *t* before *n* to *n* if, on the contrary, the latter rule had been applied first, changing *shat* to *shan*, the former would no longer have had force at all, and the reading would have stood *shannavatyâi* The next case is that in which the words *vat* and *svayamabhigûrtâya* come together (iii 2 8[1] seven times G M read *vashat* for *vat*, doubtless by a clerical error) Here, v 33 requires the insertion of a *t* between the *t* and *s*, and this inserted *t* is then, by xiv 12, made *th*, so that we are finally to read *vatth svay* if the latter conversion were first made, the reading would turn out instead *vatth svay-* (since v 33 would not then apply at all, but to the combination *thsv* would be prefixed a *t* of duplication, by xiv 1,5 the manuscripts, as usual in such cases, do not give these complicated readings altogether correctly and W B even make the blunder of substituting at last *vat svâhâ*, apparently having in mind *-vât svâhâ*, in the same division) Once more, in the passage *imam vi syâmi* (i 1 10[2] and iii 5 6[1]), we are first to convert the *s* of *syâmi* to *sh* by vi 4, and then to duplicate the *sh* by xiv 1, making *vi shshyâmi* if the duplication were first performed, making *vi ssyâmi*, then, by rule vi 4, we should have to read *vi shsyâmi* Of the three examples thus given, only the first has to do with the form of the text as given in the manuscripts, since these very sensibly ignore the rules for duplication which make up the bulk of the fourteenth chapter of our treatise

So far as regards the taking up of words for combination in their natural order, the Rik Pr (ii 2) and Ath Pr (iii 38) have rules of like force with the present one

त्रपुमिथुपूर्वः शकारश्चपरः ॥४॥

4 After *trapu* and *mithu* is inserted a *ç* before *c*

---

prathama ûshmaparo dvitîyam (xiv 12) *iti sûtradvayam prasaktam tatra pûrvatvât tanakârapûrvaç ca takâra*[11] *ity etad eva prathamam kartavyam*[12] *anyathâ* [13]*vatth svayam iti*[13] *syât tac câ 'nishtam athavâ imam vi shshyâmî 'ty atro 'pasarganishpûrvo 'nudâtte pade* (vi 4) *svarapûrvam vyañjanam* [14]*dvivarnam vyañjanaparam*[14] (xiv 1) *iti sûtradvayam*[15] *prâptam tatra dvitvasûtre* [16]*prathame kârye sati*[16] [17] *vi shsyâmî*[18] *'ti syât tan mâ bhûd iti shatvam eva prathamam kartavyam*

pûrvampûrvam iti [19]*vîpsâ sarvathâi*[20] *'vam artham samarthayati*[19]

[1] G M ins *tena* [2] W *-dena na* [3] G M om [4] W B O om [5] G M om [6] B O *sati* [7] W O *ma* [8] G M om [9] W B O om [10] G M *vashatth*, B *vata*, O *vatt* [11] G M om [12] O M put before *prathamam* [(13)] W B *vat svâhe 'ti*, O *vat svayam iti*, G M *vashathth svayam iti* [(14)] G M om [15] G M *tram* [(16)] G M *pratham ini krte* [17] G M ins *imam* [17] B G M *shyami* [(19)] G M *vipsaya sarvatrai 'tad aha 'yam iti samarthaniyam*, B *vipsa sarvatrâi 'vam arthayati* [20] O *sarvatrâi*

The passages are *sîsam ca me trapuç ca me* (iv 7 5¹), and *mithuç carantam upayâti* (iv 7 15²) the existing *pada*-text reads *trapu* and *mithu*, as this rule would lead us to expect But the right of *trapus* to be recognized as an independent word by the side of *trapu* is assured by the derivative adjective *trâpusha*, and the close analogy of *manu*, *manus*, *mânusha*

The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples one, *vibhu ca me prabhu ca me* (iv 7 4¹ ²), to show that not every *u* has a *ç* added before *c*, the other, *asinâ mithû kah* (iv 6 9⁴), to show that the insertion is only made before *s*, after the words specified

सुपूर्वश्च चन्द्रपरः ॥५॥

5 As also after *su*, before *candra*

The example quoted by the commentator is *suçcandra dasma viçpate* (iv 4 4⁶) the word occurs once more, at ii 2 12⁷ The *pada*-text reads *su-candra* Counter-examples are *pra candramâs tirati dîrgham âyuh* (ii 4 14¹ G M omit the last two words), and *â mâ sucarite bhaja* (i 1 12) their application is obvious

संपूर्वः सकारः कुरुपरः ॥६॥

6 After *sam* is inserted *s* before *kuru*

The commentator's example is *yajamânah sanskurute* (v 6 6⁴ and vi 5 5²) The *pada*-text reads *sam kurute* Counter-examples are *purodâçân alam kurv iti* (vi 3 1² G M have a *lacuna* involving this passage), and *samkrtya châvâkasâmam bhavati* (v 4 12³) The text has further *sanskrtya* and *sanskrta*, but (as is also implied in rule xvi 26) they are read in the *pada*-text as in *samhitâ*, without division, or ejection of the intruded *s*

अकुर्वं च प्रत्ययात्परः ॥७॥

---

4 *trapu mithu evampûrvah çakâra âgamo bhavati caparah*[1] *yathâ sîs-.... mith-.... evampûrva iti kim vi-.... evampara iti kîm as-....*

[1] G M *cakarap-*

5 *cakârah çakâram anvâdiçati supûrvah çakâra âgamo bhavati candraparah yathâ*[1] *suç-.... evampûrva iti kim pra .... evampara iti kim â mâ.... sv ity esha çabdah pûrvo yasmâd asâu supûrvah*

[1] G M om

6 *sam ity evampûrvah sakâra âgamo bhavati kuruparah yathâ*[1] *yaj-.... evampûrva iti kim* [2]*pur-.... evampara iti kim*[2] *sam-.... kuruçabdah paro yasmâd asâu kuruparah*

[1] G M om (2) G M om

7 And before *akurva*, after the augment.

The passage is, as quoted by the commentator, *ta ishuñ sam askurvata* (vi 2 3[1]), the *pada*-text reading *sam akurvata* The counter-example is *agnihotram vratam akurvata* (iii 2 2[2]) As *pratyaya* occurs nowhere else in the treatise, we cannot tell whether it signifies distinctively 'augment,' or, as in other of the Prâtiçâkhyas, 'affix' in general The commentator gives a scholastic explanation of the term, as indicating "that whereby the consonants are added unto, are made distinct"

नीचापूर्वो दकार उच्चापरः ॥ ८ ॥

8 After *nîcâ* is inserted *d* before *uccâ*

The passage is *madhyân nîcâd uccâ* (ii 3 14[6]), and the *pada*-text actually reads *nîcâ uccâ* This is a proceeding to which it would be hard to find a parallel in the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas To write *madhyena* for *madhyât* just before would be in itself quite as defensible As counter-examples, we receive *lokam yanty uccâvacâ 'hni* (vii.4 3[6]), and *nîcâ tam dhakshi* (i 2 14[2])

At the end of the comment is made the remark "the above are cases of insertion" (*âgama*, 'accession') The matter of irregular conversions is next taken up

असंपूर्वो ऽरमृकारः ॥ ९ ॥

9 After *asam*, *r* becomes *ar*

The passage in which this anomalous change is made is *grhânâm asamartyâi* (iii 3 8[2]), where the *pada*-text has, as the rule implies, *asam rtyâi* Here, again, we cannot praise the work of the *pada* text-maker. Nor is the rule of unexceptionable form, for the commentator is obliged to specify that the *asam* intended is one not made up of the parts of two words (not *-a sam*), else such passages as *kalyânî rûpasamrddhâ* (vii 1 6[6]), and *vahî hy esha*

---

7 *cakârah sampûrvatvam*[1] *âgamam*[2] *câ*[3] *'nvâdiçati akurva* [4]*ce 'ti*[4] *grahane pratyayât parah sakâra âgamo bhavati sampûrvah yathâ ta---- pratyayo nâmâ 'kâra ucyate pratîyanta*[5] *abhivyajyante vyañjanâny anene 'ti pratyayah sampûrva iti kim agn----*

[1] G M *-rvam* [2] G M *sakârâg-* [3] G M om [(4)] W *ca*, O G M *iti* [5] B O *pratyayante*, G M *pratyayante*

8 *nîcâpûrvo dakâra âgamo bhavaty uccâparah yathâ*[1] *madh---- evampûrva iti kim lok----- evampara iti kim nîcâ----*

âgamâ ete.

[1] G M O om

samrddhyâi (ii 2 2[1]) would be included As counter-example, to show that *r*, not a syllable containing *r*, is liable to the specified conversion, is quoted *asamtrnne hi hanû* (vi.2 11[3] G M. omit *hanû*)

अवग्रह आशीर्धूःसुवरिति रेफं परः सकारः षकारम् ॥ १० ॥

10 Of *âçîh*, *dhûh*, and *suvah*, when first members of a compound, the *visarjanîya* becomes *r*, and a following *s* becomes *sh*

The word *avagraha* in this rule is the locative *avagrahe*, says the commentator, and applies to each of the specified words, taken separately He supplies *visarjanîya*, the omission of which, or of some other word answering the same purpose, is rather a serious defect in the rule The illustrative passages quoted are *ity âçîrpadaya rcâ* (vi.2 9[4], the *pada*-text reads *âçîh-padayâ*), *dhûrshâhâv anaçrû* (i 2.8[2], p *dhûh-sâhâu*), and *dadhishe suvarshâm jihvâm agne* (iv 4 4[1], p *suvah sâm* W B O omit the first word of the citation, G M the last). The necessity of the specification "when first members of a compound" is shown by the counter-example *ye devâ devasuva stha te* (i 8 10[2] p *deva-suvah* G M omit the first two words and the last) *Âçîh* shows the same irregular combination also in *anâçîrkena* and *sâçîrkena* (i 6 10[4]), but these words are not treated as divisible by the *pada*-text The commentator goes on to point out the rules to which exceptions are established by this one viii 23 would require *âçîshpadayâ*, and ix 2

9 *asam ity evampûrva rkâro 'ram vikâram âpadyate yathâ grh-.... tatra*[1] *nimittam ekapadastham*[2] *vijñeyam anyathâ kaly-.... vahî.... ity âdâv api bhavet rkâra iti kim asam-....*

[1] G M O *atra* [2] B *-dasamstham*

10 *avagraha iti saptamyantam padam âçîhprabhrtibhih pratyekam abhisambadhyate âçîh dhûh suvah ity*[1] *eteshv avagraheshu visarjanîyo repham âpadyate ebhyah*[2] *paro yadi sakâro*[3] *vartate tarhi shakâram*[4] *âpadyate yathâ*[5] *ity... dhûr-.... dadh-.... avagraha iti kim ye.... *kakhapakâraparah*[6] (viii 23) *ity anenâ*[7] *"çîshpadaye 'ti prâptam* [8]*aghoshaparas tasya sasthânam ûshmânam*[9] (ix 2) *iti dhûssâhâu*[10] *suvassâm*[11] *iti ca prâptam*[8] *tadubhayabhangâyâ 'yam ârambhah itiçabda eshâm evâi 'sha viçesho nâ 'nyeshâm iti prakâravâcî*

[1] G M om [2] G M *tebh* [3] G M put before *yadi* [4] G M *so 'pi shatvam* [5] G M om [6] G M om *parah* [7] G M om (8) W om [9] B O om [10] B O *dhuhs* [11] B O *suvahs-*

dhūssdhāu and *suvassām* (or, as it is customary to write them, *dhūhsdhāu* and *suvahsām* only G M are conscientious about giving the double sibilant, as demanded by the Prâtiçâkhya) The *iti*, he remarks finally, signifies that only the words mentioned, and no others, are intended—that is to say, it has no particular meaning at all. It would be well if he always as frankly acknowledged the insignificance of this word where it occurs in the rules

अथ लोपः ॥ ११ ॥

11 Now for cases of omission

An introductory rule or heading, having force as far as rule 19, below, inclusive

ईंपूर्वो मकारः ॥ १२ ॥

12 A *m* is dropped, when preceded by *īm*

The passage aimed at is *īm candrā suprayasah* (iv 1 8² p *īm mandrā*) it is the only one of its kind in the text The Vâjasaneyi-Sanhitâ reads in the corresponding passage (xxvii 15) *īm mandrā* To treat the loss of a *m* here as suffered by the second word instead of the first is most arbitrary and unreasonable The particle *īm* is reduced to *ī* in quite a number of Rik passages, and before other letters than *m* they are duly noted in the Prâtiçâkhya (Rik Pr iv 36) A series of counter-examples is added by our commentator *imam me varuna* (ii 1 11⁶) shows that *m* is not dropped after another *m* in general, *agnim mitram varunam* (ii 1 11¹), that *m* after short *i* does not exercise the specified effect, *īmkārāya svāhe* "*mkrtāya* (vii 1 19¹), that *īm* elides no other consonant than *m* The yet farther restriction is applied, that *īm* here is a *padagrahana*, 'the citation of a complete *pada*,' for otherwise there would be an elision of a *m* in such cases as *prthivīm mā hinsīh* (iv 2 9¹) G M add the further example *uta çravasā prthivīm mitrasya*, which I am unable to find in the Sanhitâ

तनुपूर्व उदात्तयोर्वकारः ॥ १३ ॥

---

11 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah lopa ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah ayam adhikāras tishthanty ekayā* (v 19) *itisūtraparyanto veditavyah*

12 *makāra īm ity evampūrvo lupyate yathā*[1] *īm---- evampūrva iti kim imam---- dīrghena kim agn- --- īm iti padagrahanam*[2] *itarathā*[3] *prth---- ity ādāu makāro lupyeta*[4] *makāra*[5] *iti kim īm----*

[1] G M om [2] W *-hacarnah* [3] G M *anyathā* [4] G M *yate*, and add *tac ca 'nishtā* [5] W *-rapara*

13 A *v* is dropped when preceded by *tu* or *nu*, in case these are accented

It is when the particle *vâi*, or *vâva*, follows *tu* and *nu* that this anomalous mutilation is made The commentator quotes *sa tv 'âi yajeta* (ii 6 6[3] and vii 1 3[1] p *sah tu vâi*), and *in nv 'â upastîrnam ichanti* (i.6 7[3] p *it nu vâi*) The same *sandhi* of *tu* and *vâi* is not infrequent elsewhere (the passages are i 7 1[4],6[2] ii 2 4[8], 5 4[1] iii 2 9[2], 3 9[2], 5 1[3] v 5 9[4] vi 4 3[1] vii 2 10[3]), that of *nu* and *vâi* is comparatively rare (only at i 5 9[6] twice), that of *tu* and *vâva* I have found only once, at vii 5 6[5] Here, again, it would seem better to regard the final *u* as suffering elision, instead of the initial *v* The specification "if accented" is explained as intended to exclude such passages as *anu vrtrahatye* (i 6 12[1], 7 13[1]), where *anu* would fall under this rule by i 52 (even if the *nu* here, like the *îm* in the preceding rule, were regarded as a *padagrahanam*) Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are *idam vâm âsye havih* (iii 3 11[1]), and *pra tu janayatî 'ti* (i 7 2[4]) and *vidusho nu yajñam* (i 3 13[1 2])

उत्पूर्वः सकारो व्यञ्जनपरः ॥ १४ ॥

14 A *s* is dropped after *ut*, when a consonant follows

The commentator's example is *praty uttabdhyâi sayatvâya* (vi.6 4[6] p *ut-stabdhyâi*) This is, so far as I have discovered, the only case in the Sanhitâ from the root *stabh* similar forms from *sthâ* occur variously (*anûtthâya*, iii 4 10[3], *upotthâya*, vii 1 6[8], 5 15[1,2], *ûtthâsyant*, vii 1 19[3], *utthita*, vii 1 19[3], 2 9[3], and *utthâna*, vii 2 1[4] thrice) As counter-examples are given *jagatsthâ devâh* (ii 1 11[4]), *utkrañsyate svâhâ* (vii.1 19[3]), and *utsâdena jihvâm* (v 7 11)

This familiar *sandhi* is also the subject of Ath Pr ii.18, and Vâj Pr iv 95

एषसस्य इति च ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also *eshah*, *sah*, and *syah*

---

13 *tu nu*[1] *ity evampûrvo vakâro lupyate tayos tunvor udâttayoh sator iti vibhajya viyogo*[2] *vijñeyah yathâ sa tv---- in nv---- udâttayor iti kim anu---- apy akârâdi* (i.52) *iti prâptih evampûrva iti kim* [3]*idam---- vakâra iti kim*[3] *pra ---- vid---- tuç ca nuç ca tunû*[4] *tâu pûrvâu yasmât sa tathoktah*

[1] B O *nu*, as also B in the rule itself [2] G M *viniy-* [(3)] B om [4] G M *tunu*

14 *vyañjanaparah sakâra utpûrvo lupyate yathâ praty---- vyañjanam asmât param ity vyañjanaparah evampûrva iti kim* · *jag---- sakâra iti kim ut---- evampara iti kim ut----*

Here the *ca*, 'also,' is declared to continue the implication of "when a consonant follows" from the preceding rule The *iti* is added for the sake of clearness, it shows the final *visarjanîya* of *syah*, and attributes it by analogy to each of the other words also What indicates that this final *visarjanîya* is the letter which is to suffer elision is not so evident The illustrative examples are *esha te gâyatrah* (iii 1 2^{1}), *sa te jânâti* (i 2 14^{2} ^{3} but G M substitute *sa tapo 'tapyata*, iii 1 1^{1}), and *esha sya vâjî* (i 7 8^{3}) The counter-example, showing that the omission occurs only before a consonant, is *dama evâ 'syâi 'sha upa tishthate* (i.5 7^{4}), where, if the *h* of *eshah* were lost by this rule, x 5 would require the reading *esho 'pa*

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr ii.4, Vâj Pr iii 15,16, Ath Pr ii 57

नासः ॥ १६ ॥

16 But not *asah*

Namely, in the passage *hrtsvaso mayobhûn* (iv 2 11^{3}, p *hrtsu-asah*), which would otherwise fall under the preceding rule for *sah*, by i 52

इदुइदग्नइमांनएनौषधीःपरः सः ॥ १७ ॥

17 And *sah*, when followed by *id u*, *id agne*, *imâm nah*, *enâ*, *oshadhîh*

These are the cases in the Sanhitâ where, after the regular loss of the final of *sah*, its vowel is irregularly combined with the one that follows, against rule x 25. Such cases in the other Vedic texts are treated at Rik Pr ii 33,34, and Vâj Pr iii 14 The commentator quotes the passages affected, as follows *se 'd u hotâ so adhvarân* (i 1 14^{4} B O omit the last word, G M the last two), *se 'd agne astu* (i 2 14^{3}), *se 'mâm no havyadâtim* (iv 6 6^{6}), *sâi 'nâ 'nîkena* (iv 3 13^{2} and 6 1^{5}), and *sâu 'shadhîr anu rudhyase* (iv 2 3^{3}, 11^{3}) The first two need counter-examples, to show that *it* not followed by *u* or *agne* does not coalesce with *sa* they are *sa y*

---

15 *vyaktimishaya*[1] *itiçabdah pratyekam esha ity âdîn*[2] *visarjanîyântân*[3] *dyotayati cakâro vyañjanaparatâm anvâdiçati eshah sah syah eshu*[4] *visarjanîyo vyañjanaparo lupyate yathâ*[5] *esha*---- *sa*---- *esha*---- *evampara iti kim dama* ----

[1] G M *tiçishta*, O *tiviçishta* [2] G M *nâm* [3] G M *-yântatân* [4] G M ins *padeshu* [5] G M om

16 *asa ity asmin*[1] *grahane visarjanîyo vyañjanaparo na lupyate hrt*---- *apy akârâdi* (i 52) *iti prâpter*[2] *nishedhah*[3]

[1] G M *etas-* [2] G M *-tih* [3] G M om

janena (ii 3 14[3]) and *sa id deveshu gachati* (iv 1 11[1]) The third also wants a countei-example, to prove the need of *nah* after *imâm* it is found in *sa imâm abhy amrçat* (v 5 2[4]) Finally, to show that only *sah* undergoes the prescribed effect before the woids specified in the rule, we have *paro divâ para enâ* (iv 6 2[2])

अवग्रह इत्येकम् ॥ १८ ॥

18 Also *ity ekam*, when *ekam* is the former membei of a compound

The passage aimed at is *pâpîyânt syâd ity ekâikam tasya juhuyât* (v 1 1[2] but as given by W O, without the fiist two words, it is also found again at v 4 5[5] G M omit *juhuyât*), and the *pada*-text actually reads *ekam-ekam* The case is akin with that which forms the subject of the next rule Two countei-examples are given, to justify the terms of the iule they are *ardhukañ syâd ity ekam agre 'tha* (vi 2 3[5] only G M have the first two woids), and *yad ekamekañ sambharet* (i 6.8[2])

तिष्ठन्त्येकया सपूर्वः ॥ १९ ॥

19 Also *tishthanty ekayâ*, along with the preceding letter

The commentatoi quotes the passage *tishthanty ekâikayâ stutayâ* (vii 5 8[4]), the *pada*-reading is *ekayâ-ekayâ* As counter-example, where the same word remains unmutilated, is given *samânânâm karoty ekayâikayo 'tsargam* (vi 1 9[4] only G M have the first word)

In this rule and the foregoing are noted, but at the same time ignored, the first occurrences of the compound *ékâika*, which (see the St Petersburg Lexicon) is not very raie in the Çatapatha Brâhmana and later

---

17 ------ [1] *evamparah sahkâra*[2] *ity atra visarjanîyo lupyate yathâ se 'd---- se 'd---- v*[3] *agna ity âbhyâm*[4] *kim sa ---- sa---- se---- na iti kim* [5]*sa---- sâi---- sâu---- sa iti kim paro---*

[1] G M ins *iti* [2] W B O *sakâra*, G M *sa* [3] W B *id*, G M O *u* [4] B O *etâbhyâm* [5] A *lacuna* in B, to near the end of the comment on rule 18

18 *itiçabdaviçishta ekam ity asminn avagrahe makâro lupyate yathâ*[1] *pâp---- avagraha iti kim ardh---- itiçabdaviçishta iti kim* [2] *yad---*

[1] G M om [2] End of the *lacuna* in B

19. *tishthantiçabdaviçishta ekaye 'ty asmin grahane 'ntyo*[1] *varnah sapûrvah pûrvasahito lupyate yathâ*[2]. *tish----- tishthantî 'ti kim sam---- pûrvena saha vartata iti sapûrvah*

[1] G M *yasvaro* [2] O om

The terms in which the rule is expressed show that, from rule 15 on, the implication has been of a "final" letter as liable to the effect prescribed We have reason to be surprised that it was not distinctly stated when first made

नकारः शकारं चपरः ॥२०॥

20 A *n*, when followed by *c*, becomes *ç*

The commentator's illustrative examples are *ahīn̄ç ca sarvân jambhayan* (iv 5 1[2]), *rtūn̄ç ca tasya nakshatriyâm ca* (vii 1 3[2] G M omit *ca*), and *karnân̄ç câ 'karnân̄ç ca* (i 8 9[3]) The counter-examples, to show that only *n* is so changed, and *n* itself only before *c*, not before other palatal mutes, are *çam ca me* (iv 7 3[1]), and *tân chandobhir anu* (i 5 9[7] G M omit *anu*)

The nature of the conversion taught in this rule, and of the kindred ones forming the subject of rules vi 14 and ix 20, as being a historical, not a euphonic process, has been sufficiently explained and illustrated in the note to Ath Pr ii 26 At the same place will be found noted the usage of the other Vedic texts as regards the *sandhi n̄çc* the Atharvan and the Vâjasaneyi-Sanhitâ make it uniformly, the Rik only occasionally In the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ it is prevailingly usual I have noted thirty-nine examples of it, against the eight exceptions mentioned in the next rule

The definition of the *sandhi*, of course, is not complete without the aid of rules xv 1–3, which teach that, where *n* has been converted into a sibilant, the preceding vowel is nasalized, or has *anusvâra* added to it A better course, according to our understanding of the history of the phenomenon, would be to teach the insertion of a *s* (or *visarjanîya*) and the change of *n* to *anusvâra* before it but the makers of the Prâtiçâkhyas concern themselves much less about the theoretical accuracy than the mechanical aptitude of their rules

नायन्नैरयन्नार्ध्नुवन्ननड्वान्घृणीवान्वारुणानेवास्मिन् ॥२१॥

21 But not the *n* of *âyan*, *âirayan*, *ârdhnuvan*, *anadvân*, *ghrnîvân*, *vârunân*, and *evâ 'smin*

The passages are *lokam âyan catasrah* (v 2 3[4]), *yâm âirayan*

---

20 *cakâraparo*[1] *nakârah çakâram âpadyate yathâ*[2] *ah-.... rt-.... kar-.... nakâra iti kim çam.... capara iti kim tân-.... cah*[3] *paro yasmâd asâu caparah*

[1] G M *caparo* [2] O om [3] G M O *cakarah*

21 ...... *eteshu*[1] *grahaneshu nakârah çakâram nâ 'padyate caparo 'pi yathâ*[2] *lo-.... yâm.... loka.... anad-.... ghrn-.... vâr-.... evâ.... *[3]*eve 'ti kim*[3] *asm-....*

[1] G M *eshu* [2] G M O om [3] B om

candramasi (i 1 9³), *loka ârdhnuvan carunâ 'smin* (v 5 1⁵ only G M have the first word), *anadvân ca me dhenuç ca me* (iv 7 10²), *ghrnîvân cetati tmanâ* (iii 5 11¹), *vârunân catushkapâlân nir vapet* (ii 3 12¹ only W has the last two words), and *evâ 'smin cakshur dhattah* (ii.2 9³ ⁴, 3 8²) *Evâ 'smin* is found once more, in a slightly different connection, at ii 3 8¹ the others occur only in the passages cited A counter-example, *asmiñç câ 'mushmiñç ca* (vii 3 4¹,5²), is given to prove the need of specifying *eva* before *asmin*

By rule 24, below, the *ñ* in all these cases is assimilated to the *c*, and should be so written in the text My own manuscript of the Sanhitâ, in fact, follows the authority of the Prâtiçâkhya, and represents the assimilated nasal in the same manner as an assimilated *m*, except in a single case (*ârdhnuvan car-*) The Calcutta edition, however, in the part hitherto published, gives *ñ c* only once (i 1 9³), and everywhere else *n c*

तकारश्चकारं शचछपरः ॥ २२ ॥

22 A *t*, when followed by *ç*, *c*, or *ch*, becomes *c*

The form assumed by initial *ç* after this assimilation is taught in rules 34–37, below

The commentator's examples are *tac chamyoh* (ii 6 10²˒² ³), *tac câ 'daduh* (vii.1 5³), and *tac chandasâm chandastvam* (v 6 6¹) He proceeds to point out that the *ç*, *c*, and *ch*, all mentioned in the rule as upon the same footing, are to be understood as original (not the products of previous euphonic processes), that being their chief or primary value otherwise the mention of *ç* at all would be superfluous, since, the *ç* being (by v 34) ordered changed to *ch* after a mute, it would be enough for this rule to say "when followed by *c* or *ch*" Moreover, if the latter rule were applied, then, after it, the application of the earlier rule would not be suitable (*svarasa*, 'having its own proper flavor,' the word is not used elsewhere), as it would constitute an offense against the third rule of this chapter

---

22 *çacachaparas takâraç cakâram âpadyate yathâ tac---- tac---- tac---- atra çacachapara iti sâmânyoktânâm*[1] *nimittânâm*[2] *prakrtitvam*[3] *vijñeyam mukhyatvât tatra*[4] *prâkrtavâikrtayoh prâkrtam*[5] *mukhyam anyathâ çakâragrahanavâiyarthyât*[6] *kuto vâiyarthyam sparçapûrvah çakâraç chakâram* (v 34) *iti çakârasya chatve krte takâraç cakâram cachapara*[7] *ity etâvatâi 'va siddher*[8] *iti brûmah kim ca parasûtre pravrtte sati paçcât pûrvasûtraprasaranam na svarasam*[9] *tatra pûrvampûrvam prathamam* (v 3) *iti niyamabhañgaprasañgât*[10]

[1] G M B O *nyeno 'kt-* [2] W O *prani-* [3] G M *prâkrtatv-* [4] G M om [5] G M *tatvam* [6] G M *-yâc ca* [7] G M B *çacacha-* [8] G M *sidhir* [9] G M *bhavati* [10] G M *nyâyabh-*

जपरो जकारम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. When followed by *j*, it becomes *j*.

The cited example is *taj jayânâṁ jayatvaṁ* (iii.4.4): rather superfluously, a counter-example is also given: *tat pravâte* (vi.4.7[2]).

नकार एतेषु ञकारम् ॥ २४ ॥

24. A *n*, before the same letters, becomes *ñ*.

As *eteshu* is plural, we are obliged, having recourse to that which lies nearest, to regard as implied the letters pointed out in the last two rules as requiring certain changes in those that precede them: that is to say, *ç*, *c*, *ch*, *j*. These are, in fact, the whole class of palatals, since *ñ* never occurs at the beginning of a word, nor, indeed, in any independent position, and since *jh* is found nowhere in any Vedic text. The dental *n*, then, never maintains itself before a palatal, but is assimilated to it. The other treatises teach virtually the same doctrine: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.11.

The commentator's illustrative example for *n* before *ç* (where, to complete the combination, rule 34 below has also to be applied) is *tenâi 'vâi 'nâñ chamayati* (iii.4.8[4]). As for *n* before *c*, he points out that the rule applies only to the cases where the *n* does not become *ç* by v.20, as excepted by v.21, and quotes again one of the examples given under the latter rule, *lokam âyañ catasraḥ* (v.2.3[4]). Before *ch*, he gives the phrase already quoted as counter-example under v.20, *tâñ chandobhir anu* (i.5.9[7]); and before *j*, *aparûpam âtmañ jâyate* (iii.5.7[3]). As general counter-example, finally, he gives *tânt subdhân* (ii.4.1[1]), where *n*, coming before *s*, is treated in a quite different manner.

The occurrence of *n* before *ch*, which does not once happen in the Atharvan, is found not less than nine times in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ. My own MS. reads every time *nch*, combining the dental nasal with the palatal aspirate. The Calcutta edition, at the only place which it contains as yet, reads *ñch*.

---

23. *sâṁnidhyât takâra iti labhyate: japaras takâro jakâram âpadyate. yathâ*[1]*: taj.... evampara iti kim: tat....*

[1] G. M. om.

24. *eteshv iti bahuvacananirdeçât*[1] *pratyâsannam evâ 'napekshya*[2] *sûtradvayastheshu paranimitteshu sampratyayaḥ*[3]*: tasmâd eteshv iti: çacachajeshu*[4] *parata*[5] *ity arthaḥ: nakâro ñakâram âpadyate. yathâ*[6]*: te-....: çatvâpattâu nishiddho*[7] *yo nakâraḥ so 'tra caparatvena vishayîkriyate. lok-....: tâñ....: apa-.... evampara iti kim: tânt....*

[1] W. *-rdiç-*. [2] G. M. *'navek-*. [3] G. M. *praty-*. [4] W. O. *-chabhujeshu*. [5] W. *para;* G. M. *pareshv*. [6] G. M. om. [7] G. M. B. O. put after *yo*.

The combination of final *n* with initial *ç*, producing, according to all the phonetic text-books (with trifling exceptions see note to Ath Pr ii.17), *ñch*, is decidedly of more common occurrence But here, too, my own MS reads, with but a single exception among the cases which I have noted, *nch* the Calcutta text is inconsistent with itself, now giving *ñ* (as at ii.2 12[3]), now *n* (as at i 3 9[1])

Final *n* is found yet more frequently before initial *j*, or some scores of times in all As regards its method of writing the combination, my manuscript is about equally divided between *nj* and *mj* The Calcutta text is equally wavering, and there is no approach to consistency between the two authorities, or to recognizable principle in either in both alike, the variation seems wholly accidental and arbitrary

Such being the case, I think it clear that a careful editor of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ ought to disregard, as of no authority or consequence, the variations, or the unanimity, of his manuscripts upon all these points, and to adopt uniformly the reading prescribed by the Prâtiçâkhya (either *ñ* or *m*), wherever a final *n* comes to stand before a palatal mute

लपरौ लकारम् ॥ २५ ॥

25 Both *t* and *n*, when followed by *l*, become *l*

The dual *laparâu* indicates that the *t* and *n*, already treated of, are the letters aimed at in this rule, says the commentator He cites as examples *yal lohitam parâpatat* (ii 1 7[2] G M omit the last word), and *trîn lokân ud ajayat* (i.7 11[1] only G M have *ud ajayat*) The combination of *n* and *l* is finished by the next rule, and will be further remarked upon in the note thereto

नकारो ऽनुनासिकम् ॥ २६ ॥

26 The *n* becomes nasalized *l*

As the nasal quality of *n* itself is already established by rule ii.30, explains the commentator, it could not properly be defined here again as nasal. Hence the *anunâsikam* of the present precept must be understood as qualifying the *l* of like position into which the *n* is converted. this *l* is to be a nasal *l* No additional example is given, the combination having been illustrated under the preceding rule

There are in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ over a hundred cases of the meeting of final *n* with initial *l*, and in fully two-thirds of them

---

25 *dvivacanasâmarthyâd*[1] *grhîtâu prakrtâu*[2] *takâranakârâu lakâram âpadyete*[3] *laparâu yathâ*[4] *yal.... trîn.... lah*[5] *paro yâbhyâm tâu laparâu*

[1] G M. *thya* [2] G M. om [3] MSS *-yate* [4] G M om [5] G M *lakârah*

my MS reads *nl* simply, without attempting any accommodation of the two sounds to one another In the remaining cases, it treats the *n* in the same way as it would treat a *m*, substituting for it the ordinary *anusvâra*-dot over the preceding *akshara* The Calcutta text varies between *nl* and *n̐ll* Here, as in the cases treated above, there seems to be every reason why an editor should follow one consistent method, as the irregularities of the manuscripts have no ground but accident—and, not less certainly, the method prescribed by the Prâtiçâkhya is the one better entitled to be followed. As to the way in which the nasal *l* shall be represented, there may be some question As I have already mentioned (note to ii 30), I cannot think that the designation of the Calcutta edition is at all to be commended, since it properly implies the insertion of an *anusvâra* between the preceding vowel and a doubled *l*, and thus quite distorts the character of the combination—except as this is viewed by Âtreya, as noted in a later rule (v 31) The method followed in my MS, on the other hand, is theoretically unobjectionable, since there is no phonetic difference recognized, or to be recognized, by phonetic theory between the combination of *n* and *l* and that of *m* and *l* it has only the practical inconvenience of not distinguishing to the eye these two combinations—and this is of very small account, since there can be few if any cases where the least ambiguity would result If the nasal *l* is to be written separately, it should properly have the *virâma* beneath and the sign of nasality over it That is to say, one ought always to print either अस्मिल्ँ लोके or अस्मिं लोके, not अस्मिँल्लोके

In romanized text, as the assimilated *m* is represented by *m̢*, so, by an analogous method and for the sake of convenient distinction, the assimilated *n* may be very suitably represented by *n̢*, and this is the sign with which I have chosen to write it, both before *l* and before the palatals

All the Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath Pr ii.35) agree in converting both *n* and *m* before *l* into a nasal *l*

मकारः स्पर्शपरस्तस्य सस्थानमनुनासिकम् ॥ २७ ॥

27 A *m*, when followed by a mute, becomes a nasal of like position with it

The commentator's examples are *yam kâmayeta* (i 6 10⁴ et al), *çam ca me* (iv 7 3¹), *tam te duçcakshâh* (iii.2 10²), and *tam prat-*

26 *anusvârottamâ*[1] *anunâsikâh* (ii 30) *iti nakârasyâ 'nunâsikatve siddhe* [2] *punar atrâ 'pi tatkathanam anupapannam tasmâd atra lakshanayâ nakâro nâma tatsthâno lakâra*[3] *ity arthah asâv* [4] *anunâsikam bhajate*[5] *pûrvoktam evo 'dâharanam*

[1] W *nanu anunâsvâ-* [2] G M ins *'pi* [3] G M *nak* [4] G M ins *lakaro* [5] G M *bhajeta*

nathâ (i. 4. 9). Of *m* before a lingual he is able to give no example, as such a concurrence is not to be found in the Sanhitâ.

अन्तस्थापरश्च सवर्णमनुनासिकम् ॥ २८ ॥

28. Followed by a semivowel, it becomes a nasal of like quality with it.

From the class of semi-vowels is excepted *r*, by the next rule. Examples are given for the others, as follows: *saṁyattâ âsan* (i. 5. 1[1] et al.), *suvargam lokam* (i. 5. 4[4] et al.), *saṁvatsarah* (i. 5. 1[3] et al.: the *pada*-text, like that of the Atharvan, reads *sam-vatsarah*, while that of the Rik leaves the word undivided). No attempt is made in the manuscripts or the printed text of the Sanhitâ to give a special representation to these nasal semi-vowels standing for an assimilated *m*: it is left to be understood that the sign of nasality over the preceding *akshara* stands for a nasal letter of like quality with the following consonant in the case of the semi-vowels, just as in that of the mutes, provided for by the preceding rule. Nor are the manuscripts of the Prâtiçâkhya and its commentary any more particular—saving that G. M. usually write, instead of *my*, the combination *yy*, without any sign of the nasality of the first *y*.

Only the Ath. Pr. disagrees with our treatise in its treatment of *m* before the semi-vowels, acknowledging no nasal *y* or *v*, but a *l* alone (see note to Ath. Pr. ii. 35).

The commentator explains the word *anunâsika*, 'nasal,' in the rule, by *anunâsikadharmaviçishta*, 'distinguished by nasal quality,' but afterward raises a difficulty over it, in terms which imply that he regards it as a noun, 'a nasal,' asking, how we are to understand it here as equivalent to *sânunâsika*, 'combined with nasality.' As it is, in fact, originally and properly an adjective, signifying 'possessed of nasal quality,' and is constant-

---

27. *sparçaparo makâras tasya sparçasya sasthânam anunâsikam*[1] *bhajate: yathâ*[2] *yam---- çam---- tam---- tam----. samânam sthânam yasyâ 'sâu sasthânah: tam*[3]. *sparçah paro yasmâd asâu sparçaparah.*

[1] W. om. [2] G. M. om. [3] B. G. M. om.

28. *cakâro makâram anvâdiçati. antasthâparo makâras tasyâ antasthâyâh savarnam sadrçam anunâsikam*[1] *anunâsikadharmaviçishtam bhajate: yathâ: sam----- suv----- sam----. nanv anunâsikam ity anena sânunâsikam*[2]*katham labhyate*[2]*. ucyate: *[3]*nitarâm parihârah*[3]*. yato dharmavâcakah çabdo dharminam*[4] *api*[5] *kathayati: *[6] *çuklah pato nîlam utpalam ity âdivat*[7].

[1] B. O. om. (2) W. om.; O. *ity anena sanunâsikam katham upalambhamahe*; G. M. *sakalam upalambhâmahe yathâ*. (3) O. om. [4] W. *dharmena*. [5] W. *avika*; O. *avi*. [6] G. M. ins. *yatha*. [7] G. M. *adi*.

ly so used and applied in the Prâtiçâkhya, the difficulty is worse than hair splitting, it is a downright perversion The answer by which it is met is a quibble worthy of being matched with it "because a word expressing a quality also designates the object possessing that quality, as, for example, when we say 'a white cloth,' 'a blue lotus'" As if the words "white" and "blue" strictly applied to the color alone, and did not just as properly mean 'of white color,' 'of blue color'!

न रेफपरः ॥ २९ ॥

29 But not when followed by *r*

R being also a semi-vowel, *m* would be converted into a corresponding nasal before it by the previous rule, but for this special exception The instances given of the treatment of *m* before *r* are *pra samrâjam prathamam adhvarânâm* (i 6 12[3] G M have only the first two words), and *sâmrâjyâya sukratuh* (i 8 16[1]) They are particularly ill selected, as neither case comes under the action of the preceding rule, they fall, rather, under xiii 4, and are, in fact, the two passages there given as examples of the peculiar treatment of *sam* before *râj* We ought to have, instead, such passages as *pratyushtañ rakshah* (i 1 2[1]), *vi vayañ ruhema* (i 1 2[2])—which, of course, are of exceedingly frequent occurrence in the Sanhitâ

The omission of *m* before *r*, and the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of *anusvâra* after the latter, are taught below, in rules xiii.2, xv 1–3 The written and printed texts are consistent in their recognition of the mode of combination thus prescribed, always setting the proper *anusvâra* sign before *r*, while before *y*, *l*, *v* they write the assimilated *m* just as before the mutes

यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३० ॥

30 Nor, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*

The authorities referred to, of course, would leave the *m* to be treated before these letters as before *r*, and would acknowledge no

---

29 *antasthâtvâd rephaparasyâ*[1] *'pi makârasya tatsavarṇânunâsikaprâptir*[2] *anena nishidhyate na khalu rephaparo*[3] *makârah pûrvoktam bhajate yathâ*[4] *pra---- sâm---- rephah paro yasmâd asâu rephaparah.*

[1] G M *rephasya tatp-* [2] G M *-kapattih prâptâ* [3] G M *pakaro* [4] G M om.

30 *cakâro nishedhânvâdeçakah*[1] *prakrto*[2] *makâra ekeshâm âcâryânâm pakshe yakâraparo vâ*[3] *vakâraparo*[4] *vâ na savarnam anunâsikam bhajate yathâ*[5] *sam- sam-*

[1] G M *âkarshakah* [2] W B *prâk-* [3] B O om [4] B om [5] G M om

nasal semi-vowel save *l* Their opinion is again quoted in connection with the rule respecting the actual treatment of *m* before *r* (xiii 3), and the commentator there calls attention to the fact that the "some teachers" spoken of are the same with those here noticed who they are, he does not attempt to tell us The view held by them is the same with that taken by the Atharva Prâtiçâkhya, as pointed out above (see Ath Pr ii.35, and the note upon it), but, until we know much more than we do at present of the history and mutual relations of these phonetic treatises, it would be highly venturesome to conclude that the authors of this Prâtiçâkhya had here in mind the other one and its authors

I find it difficult to discover any good phonetic reason why the assimilation of *m* should not yield a like result before all the semi-vowels, and why, if we are to admit an *anusvâra* at all, it would not find a particularly appropriate place as representing the sound into which *m* might naturally pass before *y*, *r*, *l*, and *v*

As examples, are repeated *samvatsarah* and *samyattâh* (see under rule 28, above)

उत्तमलभावात्पूर्वो ऽनुनासिक इत्यात्रेयः ॥ ३१ ॥

31 Âtreya holds that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the previous vowel is nasalized

As has been pointed out above, Âtreya's view of the combination is the one represented accurately by the mode of writing adopted in the Calcutta edition It is not elsewhere supported in the Prâtiçâkhyas Its quotation here seems a little unprepared, or the expression of it given in the rule imperfect, as we have been directed to convert *m* and *n*, not into *l*, but into a nasal *l* One might think, too, that it would be in better place at the beginning of chapter xv, where certain other differences of opinion on kindred points are rehearsed

The commentator gives Âtreya the title of *muni*, 'sage,' instead of *âcârya*, 'teacher'

To illustrate the sage's style of making the combination, he cites *trîn̐l lokân* (i 7 11[1]) and *suvargan̐l lokam* (i.5 4[4] et al.), but not one of the manuscripts of the commentary takes the pains to write the extracts as they should be written, to serve their purpose as illustrations Finally, he adds the caution that "this rule and the preceding are not approved"

ङूर्वः ककारः सषकारपरः ॥ ३२ ॥

---

31 *uttamasya nakârasya makârasya*[1] *vâ labhâvâl lakârâpatteh pûrvasvaro 'nunâsiko bhavatî 'ty âtreyo nâma munir manyate yathâ*[2] *trîn---- suv---- uttamayor labhâva uttamalabhâvah*[3] *tasmât*

sûtradvayam etad anishtam

[1] G M put before *nak-* [2] G M om [3] G M om

32 After *ṅ* is inserted a *k* before *s* and *sh*

The commentator's examples are *pratyaṅk somo atidrutah* (i 8 21 but G M have instead *sadṛṅk samânâih*, ii 2 8[6]), and *pratyaṅk shadaho bhavati* (vii 4 2[5] O G M omit *bhavati*) As counter-examples, showing that the insertion is made only under the circumstances specified, he gives *pratyaṅ hotâram* (vi.3 1[5]), and *tat savituh* (i 5 6[4] et al) and *tat shodaçî* (vi 6 11[1])

The combinations here treated of are not otherwise than rare in any Vedic text In the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ I have found no other instance of the meeting of *ṅ* and *sh* than the one quoted, of *ṅ* before *s*, besides the two here given, occur two others, at vi 3 1[6] and iv 4 4[7 8], but, in the latter passage, the division of the section into half-centuries falls between the two letters, as the text is at present written, and prevents the exhibition of the *sandhi* Neither the Calcutta edition (so far as yet printed) nor my manuscript makes in any of these passages the insertion required by the Prâtiçâkhya and it may properly enough be considered a question whether the latter's authority ought to be followed in a matter of this character, any more than in regard to the duplications which form the subject of chapter xiv Nevertheless, considering the phonetic reasonableness of this particular insertion, and its close analogy with that of *t* between *n* and *s* (see the next rule), I should myself decidedly incline to write *ṅk s* and *ṅk sh* The manuscripts of the commentary, it should be remarked, try to follow the directions of the rule, W B O reading *ṅks*, and W O *ṅksh* (with the *k* and *sh* united in the usual sign for *ksh*), while G M even yield to the requirement of xiv 12, and give us *ṅkhs* and *ṅkhsh* This last is a refinement which no one, probably, would care to see introduced into our printed texts

As is shown in detail in the note to Ath Pr ii.9, the teachings of the Ath Pr and Vâj Pr are virtually in agreement with those of our own treatise as regards the insertions prescribed in this rule and the next, while the Ṛik Pr merely mentions them as enjoined by some authorities

टनकारपूर्वश्च तकारः ॥ ३३ ॥

33 After *t* or *n* is inserted a *t*

The examples given for these combinations are *vashatt svâhâ* (vii 3 12 nine times), and *vidvânt somena yajate* (iii 2 2[3]), and, in order not to be without an illustration for the collision of *t* with *sh*, one is dragged in from the *jatâ* text *anûyâjâu shatt shad anûyâjâv anûyâjâu shat* (vi 6 3[3]) to which G M even add, from the

---

32 *sakâraparah* [1] *shakâraparo vâ kakâra âgamo bhavati ṅapûrvah yathâ praty---- praty---- evampara iti kim: praty----· evampûrva iti kim tat---- tat----*

[1] G M ins *vâ*

same source, *tânt subdhânt subdhâñs tâñs tânt subdhân* (ii 4 1^{1}) Counter-examples are *shad vâ rtavah* (iii 4 8^{6}), and *tân rudrâ abruvan* (v 5 2^{6})

The final lingual *t* occurs before *s*, according to my notes upon the text, in ten other passages (iii 2 8^{1} eight times iv 4 8^{1}, 6 1^{4} v 4 3^{4}, 4^{2}, 5 2^{6} vi 2 3^{4}, 6 3^{3} vii 1 5^{1}, 4 10^{2}), and my MS does not once employ the intermediate *t* The manuscripts of our commentary, however, all introduce it, and this time B abets G M in converting it into *th*, by rule xiv 12 The combination is without doubt a very troublesome one, in the demand it makes upon the tip of the tongue but whether the transition is helped by the intrusion of a *t* is a much more serious question—and one to exercise and gratify the subtlety of a Hindu phonetist The Ath Pr also requires *tts* (ii.8), but the Rik Pr (iv 6) only notices the mode of *sandhi* as enjoined by certain teachers

It is indeed true that the strict letter of the rule requires a *t* to be inserted between a *t* and *sh*, as illustrated by the commentator from the *jatâ*-text But it would be wholly preposterous to suppose that the authors of the Prâtiçâkhya intended to teach any such insertion—which would convert the consonant combination from one wholly natural and easy to one in a high degree harsh and difficult, if not absolutely impossible They evidently relied on the non-occurrence of *sh* after *t* anywhere in the Sanhitâ for the annulling of that part of the rule's prescription—either having no regard to a *jatâ*-text, or overlooking the fact that in it the two letters would come in contact

Twice in the Tâittirîya text we have a final *t* before an initial *sh* (at v 5 2^{6} vii 5 6^{3}) Although their collision might seem to call for mediation in somewhat the same manner as that of *t* and *s*, the Prâtiçâkhya makes no special provision for it, and the manuscript text simply combines the two letters

The meeting of final *n* with initial *s*, the other case contemplated by the rule, is very frequent (there are sixty instances in the first two *kândas* I have not collected them through the whole text) Neither the printed text nor my manuscript is absolutely faithful in inserting the prescribed *t*, yet I have found but six cases in the whole Sanhitâ in which the latter omits it, and out of the seven passages in *kândas* i and ii where the former leaves it out, my manuscript confirms the omission in only one As the requirement of the Prâtiçâkhya receives so much support from the usage of the scribes, and also accords with the prescriptions of the Ath Pr (ii 9) and Vâj Pr (iv 14), there can be no question that it ought to be followed by an editor of the Tâittirîya Veda

---

33 *cakârah sashakârâv anvâdiçati takârapûrvo vâ*[1] *nakârapûrvo vâ takâra âgamo bhavati sashakâraparah vash-.... vid-...., anû-.... tânt.... evampara iti kim shad.... tân....*

[1] B om

स्पर्शपूर्वः शकारश्छकारम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. A *ç* preceded by a mute becomes *ch*

The commentator gives only an example of a *ç* converted into *ch* after *t*, the *t* at the same time becoming *c* by rule 22, above *çarac chrâutrî* (iv 3 2²) He adds a counter-example, *âçuh çiçânah* (iv 6 4¹) The occurrence of any other final mute than *t* and *n* (for which an example is given above, under rule 24) before initial *ç* is very rare (excepting *m*, for which see the following rule), and it is properly only after a dental, or after a dental or lingual, that the conversion here prescribed has good phonetic ground—namely, in the coalescence of a *t*-sound and a *sh*-sound into the compound sound of our *ch* in *church* (see note to Ath Pr ii 17) There is one case of a preceding *t* (i 3 14⁶), where my MS reads, as the Prâtiçâkhya directs, *t ch*, while the Calcutta text has *t ç* A single case of preceding *p* is treated of below, in rule 36

न मकारपूर्वः ॥ ३५ ॥

35 But not when preceded by *m*

By this rule, says the commentator, is annulled the conversion of *ç* to *ch* after *m*, which would otherwise be in order (according to the preceding rule), since *m* is a mute He instances *sañcitam me* (iv 1 10³ and v 1 10²) and *sañçravâ ha* (i 7 2¹) Being thus specially exempted from the operation of the foregoing rule, this combination, of course, falls under xiii 2 and xv 1–3, and the *m*, as before other spirants, becomes *anusvâra* An objection is raised against the pertinence of the present precept, on the ground that xiii 2 directs the omission of *m* before a spirant, and that hence there could arise no occasion for any such conversion of *ç* into *ch* as is here contemplated and guarded against The reply, however, is a very easy one, that, by rule 3 of this chapter, the requirement of the conversion into *ch*, as it is stated earlier, would have to be applied first, and that the result of so doing would be to pro-

---

34 *çakâraç chakâram âpadyate sparçapûrvah*[1] *yathâ*[2] *çarac....* *evampûrva iti kim âçuh....* *sparçah pûrvo yasmâd asâu sparçapûrvah*

[1] G M puts first [2] W G M om

35 *makârapûrvah çakâraç chakâram nâ 'padyate yathâ sañ-.... sañ-.... sparçatvân makârasya* [1]*tatpûrve*[2] *çakâre*[3] *prâptam chatvam*[4] *anena nishidhyate nanv etad anupapannam* [5]*atha makâralopah*[5] (xiii 1) *rephoshmaparah* (xiii 2) *iti makârasya lopavidhânân na*[6] *çakârasya chatvâpattinimittam*[7] *astî 'ti mâi 'vam* [8]*chatvâpâdakam malopâpâdakât pûrvam atas*[1,8] *tatra pûrvampûrvam prathamam*[9] (v 3) *ity nyâ-*

duce, in the passage already quoted, the reading *samchitam me brahma*, which is wrong

पकारपूर्वश्च वाल्मीकेः ॥३६॥

36 Nor, according to Vâlmîki, when preceded by *p*

There is but a single case in the Sanhitâ of *p* before *ç*, namely the one here quoted by the commentator, *anushtup chăradĭ* (iv 3 2[2]) so my manuscript reads, according to the requirement of rule 34, above Vâlmîki thinks it would be better to read *anushtup çâradī*—and I presume we shall have little hesitation in approving his opinion

व्यञ्जनपरः पौष्करसादेर्न पूर्वश्च ञकारम् ॥३७॥

37 Nor, according to Pâushkarasâdi, when followed by a consonant, and a preceding *n*, in that case, does not become *ñ*

This translation is made in accordance with the commentator's exposition. One might be tempted to understand the last part of the rule otherwise, not regarding the continuance of the negative as implied from the other part, translating 'and a preceding *n* becomes *ñ*,' but, besides the authority of the comment against it, this would be a mere repetitious enactment of the rule already given above (v 24) The inquiry is raised, how we know that *pûrvah*, 'the preceding letter,' means here 'a preceding *n*' The reply is, because only *n* is liable to conversion into *ñ*, and annulment is only made of that which would, without direction to the contrary, be liable to take place

The examples given to illustrate this peculiar view of Pâushkarasâdi are *âdityân çmaçrubhih* (v 7 12), and *pâpīyân çreyase* (i 5 7[4]) The edition has *pâpīyân chreyase* in the latter passage, in accordance with the approved rules of the Prâtiçâkhya, but my MS seems to have been written by a sectary of Pâushkarasâdi at this point (namely, in the margin a line or two of the context was omitted just here by the original scribe) In the former, I

---

yena chatvam eva pûrvam[10] *kartavyam syât tathâ sati makâra sparças*[11] [12]*tatpare*[13] *çakâre chatvam*[12] *âpanne sam-.... iti syât tan mâ bhûd ity etat sûtram upapannam eva*

(1) B om, excepting *lokavidhanan na* [2] G M *-vasya* [3] G M *rasya* [4] G M put before *praptam* (5) G M O om [6] G M put before *asti* [7] G M *ttatvân* (8) G M *chatvâpadakasya sutrasya malopasya ca chatvapadakasyai 'va sapurvatvât* [9] W B O om [10] G M om [11] B *ça* (12) G M *tasye 'ti makare ñakaram* [13] B *pare*

36 *cakârah pratishedhârthakah*[1] *vâlmīker mate pakârapûrvah*[2] *çakâraç chakâram*[3] *nâ "padyate yathâ an-....*

[1] B G M *dhâkarshakah* [2] G M *papu* [3] G M *chatvam*

find the reading *âdityân chmaçrubhih*, which would satisfy neither side There is one other case of the collision of *n* with *çr* (at v 6 7[3]), where I find read *n chr* So also, at v 7 1[3] my MS has *n chv*, and at vii.3 14, *n chy* These are the only instances, I believe, which the text affords of the combinations contemplated by the rule

The commentator, at the end, declares this rule and the preceding not approved, and with reason the evident intent of the treatise is that the conversion of initial *ç* to *ch* shall take place in all the cases falling under rule 34

प्रथमपूर्वो हकारश्चतुर्थं तस्य सस्थानं प्लाक्षिकौण्डिन्यगौतमपौष्करसादीनाम् ॥ ३८ ॥

38 According to Plâkshi, Kâundinya, Gâutama, and Pâushkarasâdi, a *h* preceded by a first mute becomes a fourth mute corresponding with the latter

The examples of this, the approved and customary combination of an initial *h* with a final surd mute, are, as given by the commentator, *arvâg ghy enam* (vi.3 3[1]), *sarad dhavâ açvasya* (v 3 12[2] G M omit *açvasya*), and *tad dhiranyam* (v 4 2[3] and vi 1 7[1]) In giving the first two quotations, W O G M (following a vicious and indefensible mode of combination, which occasionally appears even in carefully written Vedic manuscripts, and has incautiously been admitted into some edited texts) write *ghgh* and *dhdh* instead of *ggh* and *ddh*, and in the latter of them my MS of the Sanhitâ does the same (see the note to xiv 5) As counter-examples, establishing the restrictions imposed by the rule, we have *pratyañ hotâram* (vi.3 1[5]), *vâk ta â pyâyatâm* (i 3 9[1]), *vashat te* (ii 2 12[4]), and, in W, *â 'tishthipat te* (iv 6 9[4]), but in all the other MSS *tat te* (i 3 9[1] et al)

This is one of several instances in which the Prâtiçâkhya, instead of stating first, categorically, its own doctrine, and then mentioning others at variance with this, puts forward the conflicting views of different authorities, without appearing itself to decide in favor of any one against the rest The commentator here points out (at the end of the chapter) that the present rule presents the accepted doctrine of the treatise, the three that follow being dis-

---

37 *pâushkarasâder mate vyañjanaparah çakara sparçapûrvo 'pi chatvam nâ ''padyate çakârapûrvo nakâraç ca ñakâram nâ ''padyate yathâ*[1] *âd-.... pâp-.... pûrva ity ukte nakâra iti katham labhyate ñakârâpattir asyâi 've 'ti brûmah · prasaktasyâi 'va*[2] *hi*[3] *pratishedhât*[4] *vyañjanam asmât param iti vyañjanaparah*

nâi 'tat sûtradvayam ishtam

[1] W om [2] G M om *eva* [3] B O om [4] G M *dhah*

approved, but this does not satisfy us We might, to be sure, regard ourselves as justified in assuming that the doctrine of the authors of the work is first stated, with due and respectful mention of the authorities upon whom they especially rely in maintaining it but such an assumption does not in all cases help us out of the difficulty

अविकृत एकेषाम् ॥ ३९ ॥

39 According to some authorities, it remains unchanged

That is to say, the authorities here referred to would read, for example, in one of the passages already quoted (vi 3 3[1]), *arvâk hy enam*

As the euphonic treatment of *h* as a sonant instead of a surd letter is one of the most perplexing anomalies of the Sanskrit phonetic system, such indications as this of the fluctuating and antagonistic views of the old Hindu phonetists respecting it, and the willingness of some of them to give it the value of a surd in making combinations, are worth a great deal to us

चतुर्थो ऽन्तरे शैत्यायनादीनाम् ॥ ४० ॥

40 According to Çâityâyana and others, a fourth mute is interposed

These respectable authorities would, if their views are not misrepresented, approve the very strange-looking and hardly defensible reading *arvâkgh hy enam* (so writes W, with the utmost possible explicitness, B reads *arvâk hya hy*, O gives *arvâgh hy*, G M have *arvâghy*) The commentator tells us (one would like to know on what authority) that the "others" are Kâuhalîputra, Bharadvâja, Old Kâundinya, and Pâushkarasâdi All are mentioned elsewhere (see Index) in the text itself

---

38 *plâkshiprabhrtînâm mate prathamapûrvo hakâras tasya prathamasya sasthânam caturtham bhajate yathâ[1] arv-.... sarad.... tad.... evampûrva iti kim prat-.... hakâra iti kim vâk.... va-.... â 'ti-.... prathamah pûrvo yasmâd asâu prathamapûrvah*

[1] G M om

39 *ekeshâm mate prathamapûrvo hakâro 'vikrto bhavati yathâ arv-....*

40 *çâityâyanâdînâm mate hakâraprathamayor antare madhye prathamasasthânaç caturthâgamo bhavati yathâ arv-.... âdiçabdena kâuhalîputrabharadvâjasthavirakâundinyapâushkarasâdayo[1] grhyante*

[1] G M *-ndinyânam*, and then a *lacuna* to *pujartham* under the next rule

मीमांसकानां च मीमांसकानां च ॥ ४१ ॥

41 As also, according to the Mîmâṅsakas

The especial mention, in a separate rule, of the agreement of this school with the view of Çâityâyana and his abettors, is made, says the commentary, with an honorific intent

He adds, as was above remarked, that rules 39 to 41 are disapproved

---

CHAPTER VI

CONTENTS 1–5, conversion of *s* and *h* into *sh*, 6–13, exceptions and counter-exceptions, 14, insertion of *s* between final *n* and initial *t*

अथ षकारꣳ सकारविसर्जनीयौ ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the conversions of *s* and *visarjanîya* into *sh*

An introductory heading to the rules of this chapter—excepting the last rule

स्वानासोदिव्यापोह्ययमुकमूमोप्रोत्रीमहिद्यविपद्यवग्रहपूर्वः ॥ २ ॥

2 A *s* is converted into *sh* when preceded by *svânâso divi*, *âpo hi*, *ayam u*, *kam u*, *û*, *mo*, *pro*, *trî*, *mahi*, *dyavi*, *padi*, or a former member of a compound

The illustrative passages, as given by the commentator, are as follows *uta svânâso divi shantv agneh* (i 2 14[7] only O has *agneh*, B omits both that and the preceding word) with the

---

41 *cakârah pûrvoktavidhim anvâdiçati mîmânsakânâm câ 'ntarâgamamatam sammatam pûrvoktam evo 'dâharanam mîmânsakânâm*[1] *pûjârtham prthaksûtrârambhah*

nâi 'tat sûtratrayam ishtam

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane pañcamo 'dhyâyah

[1] G M omit to here

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah sakâravisarjanîyâu shakâram âpadyete ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah.*

counter-example *trtîyasyâm ito divi somo âsît* (iii 5 7^{1}), to show the powerlessness of *divi* to effect the change except after *svânâsah*. Then *âpo hi shthâ mayobhuvah* (iv 1 5^{1}; v 6 1^{4}; vii 4 19^{4}: only G M have the last word): the necessity of *âpo* is shown by the counter-example *na hi svah svan̄ hinasti* (v 1 7^{1}). Next *ayam u shya pra devayuh* (iii 5 11^{1}), and *kam u shvid asya senayâ* (ii 6 11^{2}), with the counter-example *tad u soma âha* (iv 2 8^{1}), to prove that *u* changes *s* only after *ayam* and *kam*. For *û*, the example is *ûrdhva û shu na ûtaye* (iv 1 4^{2}: only G M have the first word): the other passages in which it exerts a like influence upon an initial *s* are i 5 11^{5}; iii 5 10^{1}; iv 6 5^{6}; v 1 5^{3}; vii 1 18^{2}, 4 17^{2}. For *mo*, the only passage is the one quoted, *mo shû na indra* (i 8 3). For *pro*, only *pro shv asmâi purorathan* (i 7 13^{5}). For *trî*, only *trî shadhasthâ* (ii 4 11^{2} and iii 2 11^{1}). For the three remaining words, also, the text affords only the single examples given by the commentator: *mahi shad dyuman namah* (iii 2 8^{2}), *ya upa dyavi shtha* (ii 4 14^{5}), and *padi shitâm amuñcatâ yajati âh* (iv 7 15^{7}: G M omit the last word). To the prescription conveyed in the last item of the rule, which seems to demand that every *s* beginning in *pada*-text the latter member of a compound should be changed to *sh*, rule 7, below, makes the very important general exception "not after a consonant, or an *a*-vowel;" it means, then, that *s* is so changed after the *i*, *u*, and *r*-vowels and the diphthongs. The commentator illustrates only one or two of the cases in which the conversion would be required: *han̄sah çucishad vasuh* (iv 2 1^{5}, p. *çuci-sat*: only G M have the first word), *ayâ vishthâ janayan* (i 7 12^{2}, p. *vi-sthâh*: only G M have *ayâ*), and *goshtomam dvitîyam* (vii 4 11^{1}).

I have collected from the Sanhitâ all the words coming under the operation of this part of the rule, concerning the initial *s* of the latter member of a compound (just about a hundred in number, and some of them of quite frequent occurrence), but I do not think the list worth the trouble of giving here. So far as regards the Prâtiçâkhya and its relation to them, the important point is to determine whether its rules and exceptions precisely cover them—and I have to say that I have not succceeded in discovering any want of exact adaptedness to them. There is a single participle, *anusthita*, whose unaltered *s* is unnoticed and unprovided for in the chapter, but it occurs only as final member of a compound, *vishnvanusthitah* (ii 4 $12^{3,4,5}$, p. *vishnu-anusthitah*), and so, not being itself separated into its constituents, is exempted from the action of the present rule.

---

2. ...... *ity evampûrvo 'vagrahapûrvaç ca sakârah shakâram âpadyate: yathâ: uta....: svânâsa*[1] *iti kim: trt-....: âpo ....: âpa iti kim: na....: ayam....: kam....: ayamkam iti kim: tad....: ûrdh-....: mo....: pro....: trî....: mahi....: ya....: padi....: han̄s-....: ayâ....: go-....: avagrahah pûrvo yasmâd asâv avagrahapûrvah.*

[1] W B *svâna*.

असदामासिञ्चꣳश्च ॥ ३ ॥

3 Also *asadâma* and *asiñcan*

The "also" (*ca*) in this rule implies, the commentator says, that the words mentioned are preceded by an *avagraha*, according to the final specification of the preceding rule else such passages as *ayâyâm gharmam prâ 'siñcan* (v 4 3³) would fall under the prescribed action The examples are *yena kâmena nyashadâme 'ti* (vii 5 2¹, p *ni-asadâma*), and *mitrâvarunâv abhyashiñcan* (i 8 11, p *abhi-asiñcan*) The rule is given, we are told, for the purpose of ordaining that, in the case of these two words, the conversion into *sh* after an *avagraha* takes place even notwithstanding the interposition of an *a* Why not, then, puts in an objector, say "even when *a* interposes," without specification of the words concerned? Because, is the reply, the rule would then apply to such cases as *hrtsvaso mayobhûn* (iv 2 11³, p *hrtsu-asah*)

उपसर्गनिष्पूर्वो ऽनुदात्ते पदे ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also in an unaccented *pada*, when a preposition or *nis* precedes

This rule can apply only to unaccented verbal forms, since they alone can be technically *anudâtta* throughout, having the *anudâtta* sign written under every syllable In any compound beginning with a preposition like *pári*, for instance, having an acute on the first syllable and an enclitic *svarita* on the second, the syllables of the other member of the compound would not have the *anudâtta* accent, but the *pracaya* such would fall under rule 2 of this chapter The word *pada* in the rule, we are told, is intended to specify the text "a word which is *anudâtta* throughout in the *pada*-text" is what the Prâtiçâkhya means—it being, in fact, impossible that any word should be so accented in *samhitâ*-text

The commentator's examples are, for prepositions, *açmann ûrjam iti pari shiñcati* (v 4 4¹), *imam vi shyâmi* (i 1 10² and iii 5 6¹), *sâmrâjyenâ 'bhi shiñcâmi* (i 7 10³ twice, and v 6 3³ but B O read *shiñcati*, I presume by a copyist's blunder, as I find no such phrase in the text), *yajamâne prati shthâpayanti* (vi 1 4²), and *ni shasâda dhrtavrato varunah* (i 8 16¹ only B O have *varunah*),

3 *asadâma asiñcan ity etayoh sakârah shakâram*[1] *âpadyate yathâ yena---- mitr---- cakâro 'vagrahapûrvatvânvâdeçakah*[2] *anvâdeçenâ 'nena*[3] *kim aj---- avagrahapûrvatve 'py*[4] *akârena vyaveta ity ayam ârambhah nanu lâghavâd akâravyaveto 'pî 'ty etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam kanthoktyâ kim ucyate hrt---- ity âdâu mâ bhûd iti*

[1] G M *shatvam* [2] W B and O p m om *pûrva* [3] B O G M om [4] G M *sati*

for *nis*, *ni shtanihi duritâ* (iv 6 6[7] all the manuscripts of the comment, along with my manuscript of the Sanhita, read thus, as required by ix 1 compare the similar cases noted under rule 13, below) A number of counter-examples are given, showing the effect of absence of any one of the conditions contained in the rule they are *sadane sîda samudre* (iv 3 1), *brhatah çarmani syâm* (iv 1 5[1]), *vi sîmatah surucah* (iv 2 8[2] G M omit this example), and *abhi savanâ pâhi* (i 4 10,11)

The cases coming under this rule are not so numerous but that it may be worth while to report them Of verbal forms after *adhi* I have found none, after *abhi*, I have noted *abhi shyâma* (i 4 46[3]), and forms of *abhi shiñcâmi* (i 7 10[3] et al) and *abhi shunomi* (iii 1 8[2]), after *prati*, forms of *prati shthâpayâmi* (i 7 5[2] et al), and *prati shtobhanti* (ii 2 12[3]), after *pari*, forms of *pari shiñcye* (iii 3 11[1] et al), and *pari shthât* (i 7 13[3]), after *vi* (besides that quoted under rule 13, below), *vi shajanti* (vi 4 7[2]), and forms of *vi shyâmi* (iii 4 11[6]), after *ni* (besides the one under rule 13), *ni shasâda* (i 8 16[1] et al), and forms of *ni shîdâmi* (iii 5 11[4] et al) Such cases as *ni-shâdâyati* (v 3 7[2]), where the preposition, losing its accent before the accented verbal form, is combined with the latter in the *pada*-text, belong under rule 2, above The same is the case with *vyâtishajet* (vi 6 4[2] et al), where the verb has two prepositional prefixes, and is therefore written in combination with them (*vi-âtishajet*), and with altered sibilant But for this circumstance, we should require a separate and special treatment of the word, for *ati* is by this Prâtiçâkhya (i 15) excluded from the list of *upasarga*, 'prepositions,' and so could not by the present rule cause the alteration of an initial *s* of a root *Anu* is also thus excluded, whence the passage *anu sthana* (v 6 1[3]) does not fall under the rule, and the retention of its dental sibilant needs no specific authorization It is the only case, so far as I have discovered, in which the restriction of the class of prepositions to half its usual number has any bearing upon the objects of this rule

रासःसप्तेऽग्निर्निर्विदुर्मीढुःपायुभिर्वेःसुमतिर्माकिरीयुरायुराभिःसधिर्नकिस्तकारपरो नित्यम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 Also the *visarjanîya*, when followed by *t*, of *agnih* preceded by *râsah* or *sapte*, and of *nih*, *viduh*, *mîdhuh*, *pâyubhih*,

---

4 *sarvânudâtte pade vartamanah sakâra upasargapûrvo nishpûrvo vâ shatvam âpadyate yathâ açm-.... imam.... sâm-.... yaj-.... ni --- etâny*[1] *upasargapûrvâni*[2] *nishpûrvam api ni sh-.... evampûrva iti kim sad-.... brh-.... sarvânudâtta iti kim vi.... abhi.... pada iti kim kâlârtham padakâle*[3] *'nudâtta ity arthah*

[1] G M *ete* [2] G M *rgâ* [3] W *-kâ a*

veh, *sumatih*, *mâkih*, *îyuh*, *âyuh*, *âbhih*, *sadhih*, and *nakih*, under all circumstances

This is, the commentator remarks, a rule establishing exceptions in advance to rule 2 of the ninth chapter, which would require in every case *s* instead of *sh* The examples are for *agnih*, *avidushtarâsah agnish tad viçvam* (i 1 14[4]) and *medhyaç ca sapte agnish tvâ* (v 1 11[1]), with a counter-example, *varshishthe adhi nâke 'gnis te tanuvam* (i 1 8 only G M have the first two words), to show that *agnih* becomes *agnis* after other words than the two specified in the rule For *nis*, *nish tapâmi goshtham* (i.1 10[1]) For *viduh*, *vidushtaraṅ sapema* (ii 5 12[5], p *viduh-taram*), and also, in virtue of rule i 52, *avidushtarâsah* (i 1 14[4], p *aviduh tarâsah*) *vidushtarah* occurs at ii.6 11[1] For *mîdhuh*, *mîdhushtama çivatama* (iv 5 10[4], p *mîdhuh-tama*) For *pâyubhih*, *pâyubhish tvaṅ çivebhih* (i 4 24) with the counter-example *tasmâd açvas tribhis tishthaṅs tishthati* (v 4 12[1] only G M have the first two words), to show that the quotation of *bhih* (of *pâyu-bhih*) alone as *nimitta* would not have answered the purpose For *veh*, *çoce vesh tvaṅ hi yajvâ* (iv 3 13[5]) For *sumatih*, *sumatish te astu bâdhasva* (i 4 45[1] only G M have the last word) and, to justify the text in quoting *sumatih* (p *su-matih*) in full, instead of *matih* simply, we receive an asserted quotation from "another text," *pramatis te devânâm* For *mâkis*, *mâkish te vyathir â dadharshît* (i 2 14[2]) For *îyuh*, *îyush te ye pûrvatarâm apaçyan* (i 4 33) For *âyuh*, *âyush ta âyurdâ agne* (ii 5 12[1] only G M have *agne*) we have *âyush te* again at i.3 14[4] For *âbhih*, *âbhish te adya gîrbhih* (iv 4 4[7] G M omit the last word) For *sadhih*, *apsv agne sa-*

---

5 *râsah. sapte* [1]*ity etâbhyâm viçishte 'gnir ity asmin*[3] *grahane nih*----[1,2]---- *nakih ity eteshu visarjanîyas takâraparah shakâram*[4] *âpadyate*[4] *yathâ avid*---- *medh*---- *etâbhyâm viçishta iti kim varsh*---- *nish*---- *vid*---- *apy akârâdi* (i 52) *iti vacanâd avidushtarâsa ity apy udâharanam mî*---- *pây*---- *pâyv*[5] *iti kim tasm*---- *çoce*--- *sum*---- *sv iti kim pram*---- *iti çâkhântare mâk*---- *îyush*---- *âyush*---- *âbhish*---- *apsv*---- *nakish*---- *nityaçabdah kimarthah rkârarephavati* (vi.8) *avagrahah* (v 9) *iti nishedham*[6] *vakshyati avidur*[7] *ity atra visarjanîyasyâ 'vagrahasthatvât shatvaṃ na syât tan mâ bhûd iti kanthoktir* [8] *vidur ity asyâi 'va* [9] *na tv avidur ity asye 'ti dâurbalyât tatsamrakshanârtho nityaçabdah prayujyate*

aghoshaparas tasya sasthânam (ix 2) *ity asya purastâd apavâdo 'yam*

(1) (2) W transposes, breaking *midhuh* in the middle [3] G M *etasminn* [4] G M *shatvam* [5] W O *yur*, G M *-yubhir*, B corrupt [6] G M *pratishedho* [7] G M *vid-* [8] G M ins *api* [9] G M ins *shatvam*

dhish tava (iv 2 3[2],11[3]) And for *nakih*, *nakish tam ghnanti* (ii 1 11[4]) *nakish tam* is found also at i 8 22[4]

The final specification of the rule, *nityam*, 'under all circumstances,' is explained as intended to assure the inclusion in the rule of the word *avidushtarâsah* (i 1 14[4]), already quoted, which would otherwise be liable to exclusion by the operation of rules 8 and 9, below The word *viduh* itself, we are told, is all right, because of its specific mention in the text, but a little additional force is needed to bring in *aviduh* as its hanger-on The explanation is by no means of the most satisfactory character, but I have nothing to suggest in its place We have already once (see note to iii.8) had a case arising under i 52 treated as demanding a special handling

अथ न ॥ ६ ॥

6 Now for exceptions

An introductory heading, of force in the rules that follow (through rule 13)

अवर्णव्यञ्जनशकुनिपत्न्यृतुमृत्युमलिम्लुबृहस्पतिपूर्वः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Excepted is a *s* preceded by an *a*-vowel, a consonant, *çakuni*, *patnî*, *rtu*, *mrtyu*, *malimlu*, or *brhaspati*

The bearing of the first two items of this rule on those which precede it has been noticed under rule 2 The commentator's examples are, for a preceding *a*-vowel, *antarikshasad dhotâ* (i 8 15[2] et al. only G M have the second word) and *â siñcasva* (i 4 19 but G M omit the passage), of which one falls as an exception under rule 2, the other under rule 4, and, for a preceding consonant, *rksâme vâi* (vi 1 3[1]) Then, for the words specified, we have *çakunisâdena* (v 7 14), *patnîsamyâjânâm* (ii 6 10[4] G M read *-yâjâh*, which is found twice in the same division of the same section, but not elsewhere), *rtusthâs tasya* (v 7 6[6] the same compound is found at v 5 8[1]), *mrtyusamyuta iva* (i 5 9[4] only G M have *iva*), *nâi*

---

6 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah ne 'ty etad[1] adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah*[2]

[1] G M om [2] W *vadayâmah*

7 *avarnapûrvo vyañjanapûrvaç ca çakuni.... brhaspati ity*[1] *evampûrvaç ca*[2] *sakârah shakâram*[3] *nâ "padyate yathâ ant-.... avagrahapûrvatvât* [4] *prâptih* [5]*â siñ-.... upasargapûrvatvât prâptih*[5] *rk-.... çak-.... patn-.... rtu-.... mrt-.... nâi.... brh-....* [6]*avagrahapûrvatvâd eshâm prâptih*[6]

[1] O om [2] G M om [3] G M *shatvam* [4] G M ins *eshâm* (5) G M om (6) G M om, W adds *sa visrasyah avagrahapûrvatvât praptih*

'nam malimlusenâ vindati (vi 3 2⁶ only G M have the first two and the last words), and *brhaspatisutasya te* (i 4 27 and vi 5 8³), all of which, as the commentator points out, are cases falling under the last specification of rule 2, respecting the conversion of initial *s* of the latter member of a compound

ऋकाररेफवति ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also in a word containing *r* or *r*

The commentator gives one example of each case, the former constituting an exception under rule 4, the latter under the last specification of rule 2 *vi srjate çântyâi* (i 7 6⁷), and *tasmât sa visrasyah* (vi 2 9⁴,10⁷ only G M have *tasmât*)

Of other words falling under this rule, I have noted *parisrutam* (i 8 21), *visarjanam* (i 1 5²), *bahusâvarî* (iii 1 11⁴), and *gosatram* (vii.5 1¹) Compare the nearly corresponding rules of the other treatises, Rik Pr v 11, Vâj Pr iii 81, Ath Pr ii.102,106

अवग्रहः ॥ ९ ॥

9 Also in the former member of a compound

We should expect the word *avagraha* in this rule to be put in the locative case, so as to accord in construction with the preceding rule, and I have translated it as a locative Its being a nominative makes the commentator some trouble he declares *avagraha* here equivalent to *avagrahastha*, 'standing in *avagraha*,' and quotes as corresponding and customary expressions "the stages cry out," "the fat one knows," where "those occupying the stages," "the soul inhabiting a fat body," are really meant

The occasion for such a precept as this arises out of rule 4, above, which provides for the conversion into *sh* of the initial *s* of a word wholly *anudâtta*, after a preposition It was aimed, as is there pointed out, at unaccented verbal forms But the former members of compounds which are accented on the latter member

---

8 *rkâraç ca rephaç ca rkârarephâu tâv asmint sta ity rkârarephavat tasmin pade vartamânah sakârah shakâram*[1] *nâ "padyate yathâ*[2] *vi ---- *[3]*upasargapûrvatvât prâptih*[3] *tasm---* [4]*avagrahapûrvatvât prâptih*[4]

[1] G M *shatvam* [2] G M om [3] W B O om [4] W om

9 *avagrahasthah sakârah shakâram*[1] *nâ "padyate upasargapûrvaç*[2] *ca*[3] *avagraha ity avagrahastho*[4] *lakshyate*[5] *mañcâh kroçantî 'ty atra* [6] *mañcasthâh* [7] *sthûlo jânâtî 'ti*[8] *sthûladehasthah udâharanâni tasy---- mukh----*

[1] G M *shatvam* [2] W *-va*, G M *visarjaniyaç* [3] W *sat* [4] G M change place with *avagraha* [5] B O *labhy-* [6] G M ins *yathâ* [7] G M ins *yathâ* [8] B O om *iti*

would also come under the rule, as being *anudâtta* throughout, and also entitled to the designation *pada*, 'word,' equally with completely independent vocables hence the necessity of providing for their exclusion from its action The commentator illustrates with a couple of examples *tásyâm devâ' ấdhi saṁvấsantah* (iii 5 1[1]), and *múkham yajñâ'nâm abhî́ saṁvidấnê* (v 1 11[2] only G M have the first word) W B O introduce a third, between the other two, namely *abhî́ sấm agachantê 'ti* (ii 5 3[7]), but, as is shown by the accentuation and division, it does not fall under either the fourth rule or this, and has evidently come in by somebody's blunder

It is very possible that the Sanhitâ contains other cases requiring the application of this rule, but if so, they have escaped my notice

सवस्थानम् ॥ १० ॥

10 Also in *sava* and *sthânam*

The cited passages are *agnisavaç cityah* (v 6 1[5]), *anusavanam puroḍâçân* (vi 5 11[4] and vii.5 6[4]), *savanesavane 'bhi grhnâti* (vi 4 11[4], 6 11[3]), *prasavâya sâvitrah* (vi 6 5[2] G M omit the last word, and the whole example is a blunder, since there is nowhere a rule requiring the lingualization of the sibilant in *prasavâya*), and *gacha gosthânam* (i 1 9[1,2])

The word *sthânam* being cited with its special case-ending, the rule would not apply to such forms as *sthânah*, *sthânî*, which in fact occur in the compound *pratishthâna* (e g i 7 6[6] ii 4 4[1]), with their sibilant converted to *sh* *Sava*, however, having no case-ending, falls under rule i 22, and is employed as "part of a word, in order to the inclusion of a variety of cases," as the comment duly points out, and as his selected examples illustrate

न धिपूर्वे ॥ ११ ॥

11 But not when *dhi* precedes

The examples are *adhishavanam asi* (i 1 5[2] W omits this example), *adhishavane jihvâ* (vi 2 11[4]), and *adhishthânam âram-*

---

10 *sava sthânam ity*[1] *etayoh sakârah shakâram*[2] *nâ "padyate save 'ti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah*[3] *agn-.... anus-.... sav-.... pras-.... gacha....*

[1] G M om [2] G M *shatvam* [3] B *bahûnaṁ padanam arthah*

11 *sava sthânam ity ayoh*[1] *sakâre*[2] *dhipûrve*[3] *nishedho na prasarati yathâ adh-.... adh.... adh-.... dhî 'ty ayam varnah*[4] *pûrvo yasmâd asâu dhipûrvah tasmin*

[1] B G M *etayoh* [2] G M *sakârasya pûrva* [3] G M put first [4] W om

bhanam (iv 6 2⁴) There are no other words illustrating the rule, although *adhishavana* occurs in one or two other passages

Considering that an appended specification constituting a rule often applies only to the last word given in the preceding rule (e g iv 13,16), it might well enough have seemed advisable to the authors of the Prâtiçakhya to read here *dhipûrvayoh*, in the dual, instead of *dhipûrve*

संतानेभ्यःसप्ताभिःसंमिताꣳस्तनाꣳसीतꣳस्पशःसक्सनि-
सनिःसनीःसभेयःसत्त्वासस्यायै ॥ १२ ॥

12 Also in *samtânebhyah*, *saptâbhih*, *sammitâm*, *stanâm*, *sîtam*, *spaçah*, *sak*, *sani*, *sanih*, *sanîh*, *sabheyah*, *sattvâ*, and *sasyâyâi*

The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows For *samtânebhyah*, *parisamtânebhyah svâhâ* (vii 4 21) For *saptâbhih*, *trisaptâbhih paçukâmasya* (v 2 6² G M have only the first word) For *sammitâm*, *vedisammitâm minoti* (v 6 8²) For *stanâm*, *dvistanâm karoti* (v 1 6⁴) For *sîtam*, *anusîtam vapati* (v 2 5⁵) For *spaçah*, *tanûpânah pratispaçah* (v 7 3¹) *Sak* is declared a part of a word, implying a variety of forms, for example, *paçcât prçnisaktho bhavati* (ii 1 3³), *prçnisakthâs trayo hâimantikâh* (v 6 23 G M omit the last word), *prçnisaktham â labheta grâmakâmah* (ii 1 3² G M O omit the last word), and *prçnisakthâya svâhâ* (vii 3 18) I have noted no other cases, and should regard *saktha* as (by i 22) the preferable form for the *grahana* in the rule For *sani*, *tasmâd etad gosani* (vii 5 2²), for *sanih*, *asi stanayitnusanir asi* (iv 4 6² G M omit the first word), for *sanîh*, *vrshtisanîr upa dadhâti* (v 3 1³,10¹) *gosanih* is found also at iii 2 5⁷, and *vrshtisanih* at iv 4 6² As it would satisfy all these cases to cite *san* alone, in the character of part of a word (like *sak*, above), the commentator inquires why that was not done, and the citation of whole words avoided, and he brings up in reply *mrdhâ vâ esho 'bhishanno yasmât samâneshu anyah çreyân uta* (ii 4 2³ all but W stop at *-shanno*), and *nishannâya svâhâ*

---

12 ------ *eteshu*[1] *sakârah shakâram*[2] *nâ "padyate yathâ pari*---- *tri*---- *vedi*---- *dvi*---- *anu*---- *tan*---- *sag iti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah yathâ paçc*---- *prç*---- *prç*---- *prç*---- *tas*---- *asi*---- *vrsh*---- [3]*sann ity*[3] *etâvatâ 'va*[4] *siddhe kim akhilapadapâthena*[5] *mrdhâ*---- *nish*---- *ity âdâu mâ bhûd iti sus*---- *abhis*---- *sus*---- [6]*sattvâsamtânebhya ity etayor upasargapûrvatvât prâptih*[6] [7]*sarveshâm*[8] *anyeshâm avagrahapûrvatvât prâptih*[7].

[1] G M *eshu* [2] G M *shatvam* [(3)] W B O *san ity*, G M *sani 'ty* [4] G M om *eva* [5] G M om *pada* [(6)] W *satvâsasyâyâ ity ayor upasargâvagrahapûrv-*, B O *samtânebhyah svâhâ ity etayor up* [(7)] W om [8] G M om

(vii.1 19^1), as examples of the alteration of *san* *Sani* would not cover all the cases, and the treatise makes no provision for the citation of a theme ending in *i*, or any other vowel than *a*, as representative of all the forms derived from that theme For *sabheyah* is quoted *susabheyo ya evam* (vii 1 8^1 G M omit *evam*) For *sattvâ*, *abhisattvâ sahojâh* (iv 6 4^2 all the MSS read everywhere, in text, commentary, and Sanhitâ, *satvâ*) And for *sasyâyâi*, *susasyâyâi supippalâbhyah* (i 2 2^3)

All these are exceptions under rule 2, being cases of compounds whose second member begins with *s*, after a vowel other than an *a*-vowel The commentary tries (with much discordance between the different manuscripts see the various readings below) to claim two of them as exceptions under rule 4, but there is no ground for so doing

न स्वरस्पर्धास्तरीमसाहस्रसारथिस्फुरन्तीस्तुब्ज्योतिरायुश्चतुःपूर्वस्तो ॥ १३ ॥

13 But not in *svara*, *spardhâh*, *starîma*, *sâhasra*, *sârathih*, *sphurantî*, *stubh*, and in *sto* when preceded by *jyotih*, *âyuh*, or *catuh*

Of these words, the first six constitute counter-exceptions under rule 8, which excepted words containing *r* or *ṛ* from the conversion of their initial *s* into *sh* The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows *amba ni shvara* (i.4 1^2 and vi.4 4^3), *vi shpardhâç chandah* (iv 3 12^3)—these two, it is noted, are cases under rule 4, of unaccented verbal forms after a preposition—*sushtari îmâ jushânâ* (v 1 11^2), *dvishâhasram cinvîta* (v 6 8^2 G M omit *cinvîta*), and *trishâhasro vâ asâu lokah* (v 6 8^3 G M. omit after *vâi*)—both forms are, we are made to observe, included in the citation of *sâhasra* by its theme-ending *a*, according to rule i 22 other forms do not occur in the Sanhitâ, nor these elsewhere than in the two divisions quoted from—*kâmayate sushârathih* (iv 6 6^2), and *vishphurantî amitrân* (iv 6 6^2)

The next case is a very anomalous one, being the conversion of *s* into *sh* after *a*, contrary to the first specification of rule 7 The phrase is *sashtup chandah* (iv 3 12^2, p *sa-stup*) Compare similar cases as noted in Ath Pr ii 95

The combination of *sto* with the three words mentioned, although

---

13 ------ *stup ity eteshu sakârah jyotih âyuh catuh evampûrvaç ca*[1] *sto ity atra sakâra ṛkârarephavati* (vi 8) *avarnavyañjana* (iv 7) [2]*iti co 'ktam*[2] *nishedham nâ "padyate kim tu shatvam pratipadyate iti pratiprasavârtho 'yam nakârah yathâ. amba---- vi sh---- upasargapûrvatvâd anayoh prâptih susht---- grahanasya ca*[3] (i 22) *iti vacanâd akâragrhîtam* [4]*sâhasragrahanam anekârtham yathâ*[4] *dvish----*

not quite regular, has nothing strange in it The final *visarjanîya* of the first member of the compound is lost by ix 1, and the sibilant is treated as it would be had no *h* been present The examples are *jyotishtomam prathamam* (vii 4 10[1],11[1]), *âyushtomam trtîyam* (vii 4 11[1]), and *catushtomo abhavat* (iv 3 11[2]) *jyotishtoma* and *catushtoma* occur in a number of other passages, which it is not worth while here to rehearse The exception this time is to the second specification of rule 7, according to which the consonant *h* at the end of the former member of the compound would prevent the lingualization of the sibilant Of course, according to the theory of the Prâtiçâkhya (by v 3), the lingualization is first performed, giving *jyotihshtoma* etc, and then, by ix 1, the *visarjanîya* disappears, making *jyotishtoma*, as all the manuscripts, of comment and Sanhitâ, constantly read

The commentator remarks the fact that, from *starîma* on, the cases are such as fall under the last specification of the second rule of this chapter He then adds, as counter-examples under *sto*, *yad akshnayâstomîyâh* (v 3 3[1]), *catustanâm karoti* (v 1 6[4]), and *jyotis tv 'â asya* (ii 2 4[3] but G M omit this example)

There are a few other words which we might expect to see included among those forming the subject of this rule Such is *barhishad* (iv 6 1[4] et al), i e *barhih-sad* but the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts adopt the omission of the final *h* as part of their own reading, and the Tâittirîya (p *barhi-sad*) does the same, so that the irregularity of the word lies outside the Prâtiçâkhya Such, again, are *dushtara* (iv 4 12[2]) and *dushtarîtu* (iv 4 12[1]); provided that, as seems to me probable (compare note to Âth Pr ii.85), they are regarded as compounds of *duh* with *stara* and *starîtu* But these words are written by the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas *du stara* and *dustarîtu*, and the *pada*-text of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ reads *dushtara* and *dushtarîtu*, so that there is no reason for their peculiar phonetic form being noticed by the Prâtiçâkhya Once more, *trishshamrddhatvâya* (ii 4 11[5]) would call for inclusion here, but that the addition of the suffix *tva* at its end annuls the separation which would otherwise be made of the first element of the compound, *trih*, and the word stands in *pada*-text *trishshamrddha-tvâya*, and so does not require alteration in *samhitâ*

तर्द्वाꣳस्तास्मिंल्लोकान्विद्वाꣳस्ताꣳस्त्रीन्युष्मानूर्ध्वानम्बका-
नृतूनश्मन्कृण्वन्पितॄन्नॄन्कपालाꣳस्तिष्ठन्नाप्सुदत्तेनेमि-

---

trish---- kâm---- vish----' sash---- jyot---- ây----- cat---- starîmâdînâm eshâm avagrahapûrvatvât prâptih jyotirâdipûrvatvena kim yad---- sto iti kim cat---- jyot----

[1] G M om [2] G M *ity âdi* [3] W B om [4] W B O om

देवान्त्सवनेपशूंस्तकारपरः सकारं प्राकृतो नित्ये प्राकृतो नित्ये ॥ १४ ॥

14 In *tarhân*, *tasmin*, *lokân*, *vidvân*, *tân*, *trîn*, *yushmân*, *ûrdhvân*, *ambakân*, *rtûn*, *açman*, *krnvan*, *pitṝn*, *anân*, *kapâlân*, *tishthan* when accented on the first syllable, *nemir devân*, and *savane paçûn*, an original *n*, followed by a *t*, becomes *s*, when the *t* is a constant one

There seems to be no particular reason why this rule is introduced here, instead of anywhere else in the work, as it has no relation with the rest of the contents of the chapter It is a complete rehearsal of the cases in which the old *s*, with which most Sanskrit words in *n* originally ended, is retained under the protection of a following initial *t* The combination, of course, is historically identical with that of *n c* into *ñçc*, treated of in the preceding chapter (v 20 see the note upon that rule) The "conversion" of *n* into *s*, as the treatise chooses to state the case, involves, by xv 1–3, the prefixion of *anusvâra* to the sibilant

The examples quoted by the commentator are as follows For *tarhân*, *çatatarhâñs trñhanti* (i 5 7[6] and v 4 7[4]) For *tasmin*, *tasmiñs tvâ dadhâmi* (i 6 5[1], 7 5[1]) For *lokân*, *imân eva lokâñs tîrtvâ* (iii 5 4[3]) there is another case of *lokâñs* at ii 3 6[1] For *vidvân*, *ya evam vidvâns traidhâtavîyena yajate* (ii 4 11[4] G M stop with *-yena* the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ has *paçukâmo* before *yajate*, which W B O have doubtless dropped out by an oversight) For *tân*, *kaksheshv aghâyavas tâñs te dadhâmi jambhayoh* (iv 1 10[3] only G M have the first two words, and they omit the last one) *tâñs* is also found at ii 4 11[4] iii 1 9[5] iv 1 10[2] twice vi 3 1[4] twice, 4 10[3,4] For *trîn*, *trîñs treân anu* (ii 5 10[1]) For *yushmân*, *yushmâñs te 'nu* (iii 2 5[6]) we find *yushmâñs* again at vii 1 5[2] For *ûrdhvân*, *yân ûrdhvâñs tân upabdimatah* (iii 1 9[1] only G M have the first word) For *ambakân*, *tryambakâñs trtîyasavanam akurvata* (iii 2 2[3] G M omit the last word) For *rtûn*, *rtûñs tanvate kavayah prajânatîh* (iv 3 11[3] G M omit after *tanvate*) For *açman*, *açmañs te kshut* (iv 6 1[1] and v 4 4[1]) For *krnvan*, *punah krnvañs tvâ pitaram yuvânam* (iv 7 13[5] only W has the last word) For *pitṝn*, *oja iti pitṝñs tantur iti* (v 3.6[1]

14 ...... *âdyudâtte tishthangrahane...... eshu*[1] *grahaneshu prâkrto nakârah padasamaye*[2] *vartamânas takâraparah sakâram âpadyate yathâ çat-.... tasm-.... imân.... ya....; kaksh-.... trîñs.... yush-....' yân.... tryam-.... rt-.... açm-.... punah.... oja.... prân-..... api vikrtam* (i 51) *iti vacanâd etad bhavati dvâd-.... tribh-.... âdyudâtta iti kim na.... apy akârâdi* (i 52) *iti prâptih nem-.... nemir iti kim jât-.... mâdh-.... savanâ iti kim*

only G M have the first two words) For *anân, prânâṅs tasyâ 'ntar yanti* (vii 1 3[1], p *pra-anân*) here rule i 51 is invoked to show that the lingualized *n* does not render the citation inoperative For *kapâlân, dvâdaçakapâlâṅs trtîyasavane* (vii 5 6[4]) For *tishthan, tribhis tishthaṅs tishthati* (v 4 12[1]) as counter-example, proving the necessity of the requirement as to accent, we have *na praty atishthan tâ vasuko 'si* (v 3 6[3] G M omit *na*), which would fall under the operation of the present rule by i 52 For *nemir devân, nemir devâṅs tvam paribhûr asi* (ii 5 9[3] G M omit *asi*), with the counter-example *jâtavedo vapayâ gacha devân tvaṅ hi* (iii 1 4[4] G M omit the first word), to show that *devân* is so treated only after *nemih* For *savane paçûn, mâdhyandine savane paçûṅs trtîyasavane* (iii 2 9[2] G M omit the first word), with the counter-example *prajâm paçûn tenâ 'vardhata* (vii 4 3[2]), to prove the need of *savane* in the rule Then, as general counter-example, to bring out the fact that *n* is thus converted into *s* only before *t*, we have *tasmin prajâpatir vâyuh* (vii 1 5[1]) G M add also *lokân dravinâvatah* (v 3 11[2]) And finally, the commentator proceeds to explain and illustrate the limitations "an original (*prâkrta*) *n*" and "a constant (*nitya*) *t*," given in the rule An original *n* is one which is not the product of euphonic processes, but is read in the *pada*-text in *tâm tena çamayati* (v 7 3[3]), then, where the *m* represents a *n*, produced by the assimilation of *m* to the following *t* (by v 27), the rule has no force A constant *t*, in like manner, is one which is found in all forms of the text, and not in *samhitâ* alone hence, in *vidânt somena yajate* (iii 2 2[3]), the *t* which is introduced (by v 33) between *n* and *s* does not cause the conversion of the *n* into *s* The *t* in this case, to be sure, is (by xiv 12) to be turned into *th* (and is so written in the citation by W G M), but, as the rules of the treatise (by v 3) have to be applied in their order, the danger of misapprehension upon the point in question requires to be guarded against for a *t* inserted by authority of the fifth chapter might assibilate a nasal according to the sixth, before it was itself turned into an innocuous *th* by the fourteenth

The cases in which the insertion of *s* between *n* and *t* is made in the Taittirîya-Sanhitâ are thus seen to number only thirty-one On the other hand, the cases of the collision of *n* and *t* without interposition of *s* are very numerous I have noted about two hundred

---

praj- - - - takârapara iti [3]*kim tasmin- - - - lokân- - - - prâkrta iti kim tâm- - - - vâikrto*[4] *'yam nakâro* [5] *makâra sparçaparah* (v 27) *iti prâptatvât nitye takâra*[6] *iti kim*[3] *vidv- - - - anityo 'yam nakâro yatah padasamaye nâ 'sti takârah paro yasmâd asâu tathoktah*[7]

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane shashtho 'dhyâyah

[1] B O *eteshu* [2] G M *nitye pade* [3] B om [4] G M *aprakrto* [5] G M ins *yatah padasamaye nâ 'sti* [6] G M om [7] G M *takâraparah*

and eighty, and presume that I may have overlooked here and there others, so that there would be in all ten times as many instances of the omission as of the insertion In the Atharva-Veda (see second marginal note to Ath Pr ii 26) the condition of things is quite different while the whole number of collisions is much less (only ninety-five), the sibilant is introduced in considerably more than two-thirds of them (in sixty-seven cases, against twenty-eight) The comparison is of some interest in its bearing upon the question of the relative age of the two texts

---

CHAPTER VII

CONTENTS 1–12, cases of the conversion of *n* into *n*, 13–14, of *t* and *th* into *t* and *th*, 15–16, exceptions to the conversion of *n* into *n*

अथ नकारो णकारम् ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for conversion of *n* into *n*

An introductory heading, stating the subject of the chapter (with the exception of rules 13 and 14) We have treated here all the cases with which the Prâtiçakhya has properly to deal, as arising in the process of conversion of *pada*-text into *samhitâ* chapter thirteen (rule 6 seq) takes up the occurrence of *n* in a different way, determining every instance in which that letter is found in the whole Sanhitâ

षुषूकृधिसुवःसमिन्द्रास्थूर्युरुवाःषट्त्रिग्रामनिष्पूर्वः ॥ २ ॥

2 *N* becomes *n* when preceded by *shu*, *shû*, *krdhi suvah*, *sam indra*, *asthûri*, *uru*, *vâh*, *shat*, *tri*, *grâma*, or *nih*

The commentator's illustrative examples are as follows For *shu*, *ûrdhva û shu nah* (iv 1 4² and v 1 5³ O omits the first word), and, as counter-example, *grheshu nah* (ii 4 5¹), where *shu*, not being a complete word, does not (by i 50) lingualize the nasal but G M omit this passage and the accompanying explanation For *shû*, *mo shû na indra* (i 8 3) The commentator points out

---

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah nakâro nakâram âpadyata ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah*

2 ...... *evampûrvo nakâro nakâram âpadyate yathâ*[1] *ûrdh-....* [2]*grh-....* *ity atra natvam na bhavati padagrahaneshv* (i 50) *iti vacanât* [2] *mo-....* *susû*[3] *ity etayor yadâ shatvam nâ 'sti tadâ natvanishedhârtham vâikrtagrahanam ya-*

that *shu* and *shû* are cited in the rule in their altered form (not as *su* simply, which, by i 51, would include them both) in order to indicate that where their consonant is not lingualized they do not lingualize the following nasal, and he quotes in illustration *su na ûtaye* (iv 1 4²) and *sû na indra* (i 8 3) Both these passages are the same which have been already quoted to illustrate the conversion, and G M O very properly put them into the form of another text (apparently a *krama*), reading *su nah nu ûtaye*, and *sû nah na indra* *Shu* converts *n* to *n* also at iv 6 5⁶ For *krdhi suvah*, the passage is *brahmanâ krdhi suvar na çukram* (ii 2 12⁶ O omits the first word the Calcutta edition has the false reading *na*), and the necessity of *krdhi* is shown by the counter-example *svâhâ suvar nâ 'rkah svâhâ* (v 7 5² O omits the first word) For *sam indra*, *sam indra no manasâ* (i 4 44¹), and *vartaye 'ndra nardabuda* (iii 3 10¹) shows that *indra* when not preceded by *sam* does not exercise the prescribed influence For *asthûri*, *asthûri no gârhapatyâni santu* (v 7 2¹ only O has *santu*) For *uru*, *uru nas krdhi* (ii 6 11³ and vi 3 2²) there is another like case at iv 7 14² For *vâh*, *tasmâd vâr nâma vo hitam* (v 6 1³ G M omit the last two words) For *shat*, *shannavatyâi svâhâ* (vii 2 15) For *tri*, *trinava stomo vasûnâm* (iv 3 9¹ G M O omit the last word) the word *trinava* is found in a considerable number of other passages For *grâma*, W B give *grâmanî râjanyah* (ii 5 4⁴), but G M O have instead *grâmanîyam prâ "pnuvanti* (vii 4 5²) the word is found once more, at iv 4 3¹ For *nih*, *nir nenyati tato 'dhi* (vii 2 10² G M omit the last two words), and *ni no rayim* (ii 2 12⁸) is added, to show that *ni*, without *visarjanîya*, has no alterant force *Nir nenikte* (vii 2 10⁴) and *nirny* (iv 6 8¹) are the only other cases I have noted for *nih*

हन्याडुप्यमानं च ॥ ३ ॥

3 Also in *hanyât* and *upyamânam*

That is to say, after *nih*, the last of the words given in the preceding rule The passages are *yoner garbham nir hanyât* (v 6 9¹

---

thâ su---- sû---- brah---- krdhî 'ti kim svâhâ---- sam---- sam iti kim vart---- asth---- uru---- tasmâd---- shan---- tri---- grâm---- nir---- visargena kim ni----

¹ G M om ⁽²⁾ G M om ³ O *shushû*

3 *cakâro nishpûrvatvam anvâdiçati nihçabdottarayor*¹ *hanyâd upyamânam ity etayor grahanayor*² *nakâro nakâram*³ *âpadyate yathâ*⁴ *yon---- nir---- anvâdeçah kimarthah na ----*

¹ G M *-bdasyo 'tt-*, O *nishpûrvayor* ² G M om ³ W *nakâtvam*, B *natvam* ⁴ G M om

O omits the first word), and *nirupyamânam abhi mantrayeta* (i 6 8[3] O omits the last word) A counter-example, showing *hanyât* without altered *n*, is *na ni hanyân na lohitam kuryât* (ii.6 10[2])

पारीपरिपरीप्रपूर्वः ॥ ४ ॥

4 Also after *pârî*, *pari*, *parî*, and *pra*

The illustrative citations of the commentator are *pârînahyasye "çe* (vi 2 1[1]), *pari no rudrasya* (iv 5 10[4]), *vîravantam parînasam* (ii 2 12[6]), and *pra no devî sarasvatî* (i.8 22[1] O omits the last word) For *pârî* (p *pâri-nahyasya* compare iii 7) there is no other case, nor for *parî* (p *pari-nasam* compare iii 7), for *pari*, I find only *pari nayati* (ii.3 4[3] et al) But for *pra* the examples are quite numerous we have *pra nah* at i 5 11[4], 6 4[3], 7 10[2] twice ii 5 12[1] iii 1 11[2], 3 11[4] iv 2 6[5] v 5 7[5] vii.4 19[4], *pra nâmâni* at iv 3 13[6], forms of *pra nayâmi* at i 6 8[1] et al, of *pra nude* at ii 1 3[5] et al, *pranindya* at i 3 5, *pranîyamânah* at iv 4 9[1], *pra nenekti* at vi 2 9[1], *pranî* at ii 5 9[2], *pranîti* at i 4 18 and *supranîti* (but p *su-pranîti*) at i 5 11[5] et al, *pranetar* at iii 5 11[3], and *pranava* at iii 2 9[6] *Parânutti* occurs only in composition (vi 2 3[2], p *bhrâtrvya-parânuttyâi*)

अवर्णव्यवेतो ऽपि ॥ ५ ॥

5 And that, even when an *a* vowel intervenes

The word "even" (*api*) here brings down by implication, according to the commentator, the words in the preceding rule from *pari* on—that is to say, virtually, *pari* and *pra*, for there is no case of *parî* exercising such an effect The examples for *pari* are *agram pary anayat* (ii.3 4[3] all but O omit *agram* I find besides only *pary anayan*, at vi 5 7[2]), and *pary ânîyâ "havanîyasya* (vii 1 6[6]) For *pra*, we have *prânâya svâhâ* (vii 1 19[1], p *pra-anâya*), and *anu prâ 'nyât prathamâm* (v 5 5[2], p *pre 'ti anyât* only O has *anu*) The occurrence of *prâna* is very frequent of other cases, I have noted only *prâ 'nudata* at vi 2 3[2], and *prâ 'nudanta* at vi 4 10[3 4]—where, however, the lingualization of the *n* is suspended in our text, as at present constituted, by the intervention

---

4 ------ *evampûrvo nakâro nakâram âpadyate yathâ*[1] *pâr*- ---- *pari*---- *vîr*---- *pra*----

[1] G M O om

5 *apiçabdah paryâdy*[1] *anvâdiçati*[2] *paryâdipûrvo*[3] *nakâro avarnavyaveto 'pi natvam bhajate*[4] *yathâ*[5] *agram*---- *pari*- ---- *prân*---- *anu*---- *avarnavyaveta iti kim pari*---- *pra*----

[1] B *pâr*- [2] G M O -*âdeçakah* [3] B *par* [4] G M *apadyate* [5] G M O om

between the preposition and the verb of the pause which separates the third and fourth divisions of the section

A couple of counter-examples are given, to show us that the intervention of a letter of any other complexion than *a* prevents the change of nasal they are *pari minuyât sapta* (v 2 6[3] G M omit the last word), and *praminâma vratâni* (i 1 14[4])

वाहनउह्यमानोयानमयन्यवेनवश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also in *vâhanah*, *uhyamânah*, *yânam*, *ayan*, *yavena*, and *van*

According to W B O, the *n* becomes *n* in these words "when they are preceded as implied by the word 'also' (*ca*)," the commentary failing to tell us what this implication is G M, however, confess that *pra* only is brought forward (from rule 4) which is a marked departure from the ordinary usage of the treatise, since in the intermediate rule *pra* and *pari* were both distinctly understood The commentator omits, not to say avoids, noticing the irregularity Perhaps he would be justified in claiming that *pari* and *parî* are never found preceding the words specified in the rule, and that therefore it makes no difference whether they be regarded as implied or not still, even that consideration would not wholly excuse the want of accuracy and consistency The examples are for *vâhanah*, *pravâhano vahnih* (i 3 3, p *pra vâhanah*), to this, W adds a counter-example, to show that, after any other word than *pra*, *vâhanah* remains unchanged—namely *havyavâhanah çvâtro 'si* (i 3 3) B tries to do the same, but only succeeds in repeating one of the counter-examples of the last rule, *pari minuyât* (v 2 6[3]), which is not at all in place here For *uhyamânah*, *prohyamâno 'dhipatih* (iv 4 9, p *pra-uhyamânah*) For *yânam*, *prayânam anv anya id yayuh* (iv 1 1[2], p *pra-yânam* O omits the last three words, G M the last two) *Ayan* is declared a part of a word, including a number of cases, of which G M give only three, *tasmâd âdityah prâyanîyah* (vi 1 5[1], p *pra-ayanîyah* O omits *tasmât*), *prâyanîyam kâryam* (vi 1 5[3,5]), and *prâyanam pratishthâm* (i.6 11[1], p *pra-ayanam*), while W B O add two others, *prâyanîyasya puronuvâkyâh* (vi 1 5[5]), and *prâyanîye 'han* (vii 2 8[1]) There are a number of other passages for *prâyanîya*, and *prâyana* occurs again at i.6 11[2] and vii 1 13, besides its compounds,

---

6 ------ *eteshu*[1] *grahaneshu cakârâkrshtapûrveshu*[2] *nakâro natvam bhajate yathâ prav----* [3]*pre 'ti kim havy----*[3] *proh---- pray---- ayann iti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah tasm---- prây---- prây----* [4]*prây---- prây----*[4] *pray----* [5]*vann iti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah*[5] [6]*yadi----*[6] *âhav---- anvâdeçena kim. asi---- uday----*

[1] G M *eshu* [2] G M *-shtaprapûrvo* (3) G M om, O om the example (4) G M *ity âdi* (5) G M O B om (6) O om

suprâyana (v 1 11^2, p *su-prâyanâh*) and *agnishtomaprâyana* (vii 2 9^1, p *agnishtoma-prâyanâh*) For *yavena, prayavena pañca* (iv 3 11^2, p *pra-yavena*) *Van*, again, is (by W alone) declared a part of a word, intended to include many cases only two are given, *yadi vâ tâvat pravanam* (ii.4 12^1), and *âhavanîyât pravanañ syât* (vi 2 6^4), nor have I found any other, except the compound *purastâtpravanah* (v 3 1^5, p *purastât-pravanah*) Finally, we have a couple of counter-examples, showing the necessity of the implication from the preceding rule they are *asi havyavâhanah* (i 3 3), and *udayanam veda* (i 6 11^2)

प्रापूर्वश्च ॥ ७ ॥

7 As also, when preceded by *prâ*

The "also" (*ca*) of this rule brings forward from the preceding rule only the word last mentioned there, namely *van* The example is *prâvanebhih sajoshasah* (iv 2 4^3, p *pra-vanebhih* compare iii 5) I have noted no other case

इन्द्रोऽयजुःपूर्व एनंकेन ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also *enam* and *kena*, when preceded respectively by *indrah* and *ayajuh*

There is nothing in the rule meaning 'respectively,' and if *enam* were found anywhere in the text preceded by *ayajuh*, or *kena* by *indrah*, their *n*'s would doubtless require lingualization yet the evident intent of the precept is as translated The passages are *indra enam prathamah* (iv 6 7^1), and *yad ayajushkena kriyate* (v 1 2^1, p *ayajuh-kena* G M O omit *yat*) I find no other cases falling under the rule there are, however, one or two other forms analogous with the latter of those here contemplated, which we might expect to find treated in the same way, namely *anâçîrkena* and *sâçîrkena* (i 6 10^4), but they are written by the *pada*-text without division of *âçîrkena*, or restoration in it of the dental *n* (thus *anâçîrkena*, and *sa-âçîrkena*)

Counter-examples are added to show that *enam* and *kena*, when otherwise preceded, retain their dental nasals, *rudra enam bhûtvâ* (iii 4 10^3), and *brahmavâdinah kena tad ajâmî 'ti* (vii 4 10^2 G M O end with *kena*), to show that *indrah* does not exercise a lin-

---

7 *cakârâkrshte*[1] *vann iti grahane nakârah pre 'ty evampûrvo natvam bhâjate yathâ*[2] *prâv-....*

[1] W B *shta*, O *cakaro 'nvâdishto* [2] G M om

8 *indrah ayajuh pûrvayor*[1] *enam kena ity etayor nakâro natvam bhajate yathâ*[2] *indra.... yad.... evampûrva iti kim rudra.... brah-....* [3]*enamkene*[4] *'ti kim indro....*[3]

[1] G M O *ity evampûrva* [2] G M O om [3] W om [4] B *kene*.

gualizing effect upon other words, *indro neshad ati* (v 7 2³ B omits *ati*, W omits the whole example)

नृश्रीपूर्वो मनाः ॥ ९ ॥

9 Also *manâh*, when preceded by *nr* or *çrî*

The examples are *nrmanâ ajasram* (i 3 14⁵ and iv 2 2¹ W reads *yantrî* instead of *ajasram*, but doubtless by a copyist's blunder, for *nrmanâ yantrî* is not found in the Sanhitâ), and *çrîmanâh çatapayâh* (iv 6 3²), with the counter-example *sumanâ upâgahi* (iii 3 11⁵) Of *çrîmanâh* I find no other example, *nrmanâh* occurs also at iv 2 2¹ (a second time) and vii 1 12

अङ्गानामोनेगानिगानांग्यानियामेन ॥ १० ॥

10 Also *añgânâm*, *one*, *gâni*, *gânâm*, *gyâni*, and *yâmena*

These words in *samhitâ*, says the commentator that is to say, in the only cases in which they occur as *padas*, they take *n* in the combined text The passages are *yat tryañgânâñ samavadyati* (vi 3 10⁶, p *tri-añgânâm* only G M O have *yat*, and O omits the last word), *âyushi duone* (i 2 14³, p *duh-one* the *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan do not separate this word), *ati durgâni viçvâ* (i 1 14⁴, p *duh-gâni*, like the other Vedas), *purogânâm cakshushe* (iii 2 4⁴, p *purah-gânâm*), *suvargyâny âsan* (v 3 5³, p *suvah-gyâni*), and *antaryâmenâ 'ntar adhatta* (vi 4 6¹, p *antah-yâmena* O omits the last word) I have found no second example for any of these words, although there may be occurrences of *durone* which I have overlooked

रषपूर्वो हवन्यह्नेहन् ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also *havani*, *ahne*, *han*, when preceded by *r* or *shah*

The cited examples are *agnihotrahavanî ca* (i 6 8³, p *agnihotra-havanî*), *çarady aparâhne* (ii 1 2⁵, p *apara-ahne* the Atharvan has *apara-ahnah*), and further, for *han*, which is declared to be a part of a word, involving several cases, *rakshohanam* (i 2 14⁶ et al, p *rakshah-hanam* O omits this example), *vâsh-*

---

9 *nr çrî ity*[1] *evampûrvo manâ ity atra nakâro natvam bhajate yathâ*[2] *nrm---- çrîm---- evampûrva iti kim sum----*

[1] G M om. [2] G M om

10 ------ *eteshu*[1] *nakârah samhitâyâm natvam bhajate yathâ*[2] *yat---- ây---- ati----* *puro---- suv---- antary----*

[1] G M O *eshu* [2] W G M O om

navî rakshohanâu (i 3 2² G M omit the first word), and *vrtrahanam puramdaram* (iii 5 11⁴ and iv 1 3³, p *vrtra-hanam* G M omit the last word) For *han*, besides the compounds here quoted, which are found repeatedly in other passages, the Sanhita affords us also *avîrahanâu* (i 2 8², p *avîra-hanâu*), for the other two words I know of no additional examples Counter-examples are given, namely *sâhna evâ 'smâi* (vi 6 11⁴, p *sa-ahne*), and *valagahanah* (i 3 2¹ et al)

There is good ground for questioning the correctness of the commentator's interpretation of *ra* in the rule as signifying the letter *r* (*repha*), and not the syllable *ra* In none of the examples given are the words specified directly preceded by *r*, and it is not at all in accordance with the usage of the treatise to describe as "having *r* before it" a word preceded by another word containing *r* All the versions of the comment, however, unite in this interpretation, and it is farther assured by the quotation of the rule above, under i.19, as a case in which *r* is called *ra*, instead of *repha* It looks as if G M had made a blundering attempt to remedy the difficulty by reading the third word *ahan* instead of *han*, and also by understanding *shah* to mean 'the letter *sh*' (see the various readings, below), thus parallelizing the two specifications The attempt, however, is an abortive one, only issuing, if carried out, in a host of new difficulties I have made the translation of the rule conform to the requirements of the comment, but with much misgiving, having hardly a doubt that the meaning properly is 'when preceded by *ra* or *shah*'

रुपूर्वौ मयान्यनी ॥ १२ ॥

12 Also *mayâni* and *anî*, when preceded by *ru*

The passages are *dârumayâni pâtrâni* (vi.4 7³, p *dâru-mayâni* O omits *pâtrâni*, G M omit the whole example), and *tve vasûni purvanîka hotah* (i 3 14² ³, p *puru-anîka* O omits the first two words, G M the last) *purvanîka* is found also at

---

11 *havanî*[1] *ahne han*[2] *eshu*[3] *grahaneshu nakâro rephapûrvah* [4]*sha ity*[4] *evampûrvo*[5] *vâ natvam bhajate yathâ agnih- ---- çar- ---- hann*[6] *iti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah raksh- ---- vâish- ---- vrtr- ---- evampûrva iti kim sâhna ---- val-*

[1] W O *havani* [2] G M *ahan* [3] W *evam* (4) G M *shakâra* [5] W B *ekamp-*, G M *purvo* [6] G M *ahann*

12 *mayâni anî*[1] *ity atra rupûrvo nakâro*[2] *natvam bhajate yathâ*[3] [4]*dârum- ----* [4] *tve ---- evampûrva iti kim yâni ---- agnaye ---- rephagrahanena kim · svan-*

[1] W O *ani*, as also (with T) in rule, G M *anika*, as also in rule [2] G M O put after *atra* [3] W G M om (4) G M om

iv 4 4⁵ As counter-examples are given *yâni mrnmayâni sâkshât tâni* (vi 4 7³ B omits the last word, G M O the last two), *agnaye 'nîkavate* (i 8 4¹ et al), and *svanîkasamdrk* (iv 3 13¹)

वाघाषपूर्वस्तष्टम् ॥ १३ ॥

13 After *vâghâ* and *sh*, *t* is changed to *t*

The passage for *vâghâ* is given by O as *dârvâghâtas te* (v 5 15¹), all the other MSS have only the first word, in its complete *pada*-form, *dârvâghâta iti dâru-âghâtah* The same word forms the subject of Vâj Pr iii 47 As counter-example, showing that *ta* does not become *ta* after *ghâ* except when the latter follows *vâ*, we have *praghâta âdityânâm* (vi 1 1³ ⁴) For the conversion of *t* to *t* after *sh* is quoted *âyush ta âyurdâ agne* (ii 5 12¹ G M omit the last word, O the last two), whose *sh* depends on rule vi 5, above O adds a counter-example for this second part of the rule also, namely *agnis te tejah* (i 1 10³ and vii 5 17)

थश्च ठम् ॥ १४ ॥

14 Also *th* to *th*

The cited example is *goshtham mâ nirmrksham* (i 1 10¹ W B omit the last word), to which O alone adds *prati shthâpayanti* (vi 1 4²) As counter-example is given *gacha gosthânam* (i 1 9¹˒²)

न तकारपरः ॥ १५ ॥

15 But not when *t* follows

The commentator explains the connection of this rule by pointing out that the two preceding do not come under the introductory heading of the chapter—that is to say, that they deal with a subject unconnected with the rest of its contents—and that hence they are regarded as dropped out, and the present exception does not apply to them, but to the foregoing rules, for conversion of *n* into *n* This is well enough, though not a little awkward, as concerns the status of rule 15, but we should like to hear what he had to say in defense of the intrusion of rules 13 and 14 thus into

---

13 *vâghâ ity evampûrvah shakârapûrvaç*[1] *ca takârash takâram bhajate*[2] *yathâ*[3] *dârv-....* *âyush-....* *ve*[4] *'ti kim pragh-....* [5]*shapûrva iti kim agnis-....*[5]

[1] G M om , O om *kâra* [2] O *âpadyate* [3] W G M om [4] W *vaghâ*, B *vâghâta* (5) Only in O

14 *cakârah shapûrvatvâkarshakah*[1] *thakârah shakârapûrvash*[2] *thakâram bhajate yathâ gosh-....* [3]*prati-....*[3] *evampûrva*[4] *iti kim gacha-....*

[1] G M *shakârap-*, O *tvâdeçakah* [2] O om *kara* (3) Only in O [4] O *shap-*

a chapter where they do not belong, and where they sorely disturb the natural and desirable connection Considering their near relation to the rules of the preceding chapter, they might better have been added there as an appendix, or else put at the head of chapter vii, before its general adhikâra

Only a single illustrative example is quoted, namely pary antarikshât (iii 1 10[2]), where rules 4 and 5 of this chapter combined would require an at the beginning of the second word, but for the exception here made

This precept is an anticipation of one of the items of xiii 15, below, and might properly enough be looked upon as open to the charge of punarukti, or unnecessary repetition, which the treatise so carefully shuns, and the commentator not seldom labors hard to remove It is characteristic of the method of the Tâittirîya Prâtiçâkhya that it does not attempt to state the real nimitta or occasion of the lingual n in the words rehearsed here, although it does so, fully and distinctly, in rule xiii.6, where the subject of the occurrence of n in the interior of a word is taken up

नह्यतिनूनंनृत्यन्त्यन्योऽन्याभिरन्यान्यन्तश्चान्तश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16 Nor in *nahyati*, *nûnam*, *nrtyanti*, *anyah*, *anyâbhih*, *anyâni*, nor when final

The *ca* in this rule indicates the continuance of the exception These words, and a final *n*, are not subject to the rules given in the chapter for the substitution of lingual *n* The commentator quotes as follows For *nahyati*, *vâsasâ paryânahyati* (vi 1 11[2], p *pari-ânahyati* O omits the first word) he notes that the case constitutes an exception to rule 5 For *nûnam*, *pra nûnam pûrnavandhurah* (i 8 5[1] O omits the last word) For *nrtyanti*, *pari nrtyanti* (vii 5 10) For the three cases of *anya*, *prâ 'nyah çansati* (vii.5 9[3]), *prâ 'nyâbhir yachaty anv anyâi mantrayate* (v 1 6[4] O omits *pra* in all these three examples, and in this, along with G M, the last three words, B omits the last word), and *prâ 'nyâni pâtrâni* (vi 5 11[1,2]) the commentator remarks that all these (since *nahyati*) are cases of exceptions under rule 4 He then proceeds to raise the question why the three complete words

---

15 *vâghâshâdividhir*[1] *anadhikrtatvâd utpannapradhvansî tasmâd atra*[2] *nâ 'yam nishedhah*[3] [4]*kim tu*[4] *prakrto*[5] *natvavidhir anena vishayîkriyate takâraparo nakâro natvam nâ "padyate yathâ pary---- pârîparipariprapûrvah* (vii.4) *avarnavyaveto 'pi* (vii 5) *ity etâbhyâm*[6] *prâptih*

[1] W O *vâghâdi* [2] G M *tatra* [3] B *viçeshah* (4) O om [5] W O *prâk* [6] W B *âdîbhyâm*

16 *nishedhâkarshakaç cakârah*[1] ------ *eshu*[2] *grahaneshu nakârah padântaç ca*[3] *natvam na bhajate*[4] *yathâ*[5] *vâs----* *avarnavyaveto pi* (vii 5) *iti prâptih pra---- pari---- prâ*

are quoted in the rule, instead of the syllable *an*, which would include them all, and makes the very obvious answer, that it is on account of the passage *anu prâ 'nyât prathamâm* (v 5 5²), already quoted under vii 5 Finally, as example of final *n* exempt from conversion, he cites *vrtrahañ chûra vidvân* (i 4 42), remarking that it is a case otherwise falling under rule 11

The exception of a final *n* from becoming *n* is also one of those made below, in rule xiii 15, for the class of cases to which that chapter relates

I have not discovered in the Sanhitâ any case of a lingual nasal arising in the conversion of *pada*-text into *samhitâ* which is not duly provided for in this chapter

---

CHAPTER VIII

CONTENTS 1–4, conversion of a final surd mute to sonant or nasal, 5–7, of *h* to *r*, 8–15, conversions of *h* to *r* after *a* and *â*, 16–22, treatment of *h* before *r*, 23–35, conversion of *h* to *s* or *sh* before *k*, *kh*, or *p*

अथ प्रथमः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for changes of first mutes

That is to say, of surds unaspirated, or *k*, *c* (only *c* nowhere occurs as a final), *t*, *t*, and *p* The force of this heading only reaches, as the commentary points out, through rule 4—hardly far enough, one would think, to make a separate introductory rule necessary

---

---- *prâ*- -- *prâ*---- *pârîpa*, *iparîprapûrvah*[6] (vii 4) *ity eshâm*[7] *prâptih anu ity etâvatâ*[8] *siddhe 'nyonyâbhir anyânî 'ti kim pratipadapâthena*[9] *anu*---- *ity atrâ 'nena*[10] *nishedho*[11] *na*[12] *prasarati*[13] [14]*padânto nakâra natvam na bhajate yathâ*[14] *vrtra*-.... *rashahpûrvah* (vii 11) *iti prâptih*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane saptamo 'dhyâyah

[1] B G M O put first [2] B O *eteshu* [3] G M om , O adds *nakâro* [4] G M *apadyate* [5] G M O om [6] W B om *prapûrvah* [7] G M *etesham* [8] G M O *-vatai 'va* [9] O puts before *kim* [10] O *nâi 'sha* [11] G M *pratish* [12] G M O om [13] G M *-tv iti* [(14)] B O om , G M *padântaç ca*

1 *athe 'ty* [1]*ayam adhikârah*[1] *prathama* [2]*ity etad*[2] *adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah* [3] *visarjanîya* (viii.5) *paryanto*[4] *'yam adhikârah*

[(1)] W *adhikârârthah* [(2)] G M om [3] O ins *atha* [4] O *itisûtrapa-*

उत्तमपर उत्तमः सवर्गीयम् ॥ २ ॥

2 A first mute, followed by a last mute, becomes a last mute of its own series

The examples selected by the commentator to illustrate this mode of combination are *vâñ ma âsan* (v 5 9[2]), *shannavatyâi svâhâ* (vii 2 15), and *tan mahendrasya* (vi 5 5[3]) For the conversion of *p* into *m* he is able to offer no instance, as none occurs in the Sanhitâ As counter-examples, showing that only a nasal causes the conversion, and causes it only in a "first" mute, he brings up *vâk ta â pyâyatâm* (i 3 9[1] only G M have the last word), and *imâm no vâcam* (vi 4 7[3])

All the Prâtiçâkhyas join in treating this conversion as necessary, not as alternative with conversion into a sonant (see note to Âth Pr ii.5)

तृतीयः स्वरघोषवत्परः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant, it becomes a third mute

The examples are *rdhag ayâd rdhag uta* (i.4 44[2]), and *yad vâi hotâ* (iii 2 9[1])

ककुच्च मकारपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4 Also in *kakut*, when *m* follows

Namely, in the passage *kakudmân pratûrtir vâjasâtamah* (i 7 7[2], p *kakut-mân* G M O omit the last word) As counter-examples are given *ya unmâdyet* (iii 4 8[4] G M O omit *yah*), and, according to W B, *kakut trayastriñçah* (vii 2 5[3]), for which G M O substitute *kakuc chandah* (iv 3 12[2]) The commentator

---

2 *uttamaparah prathamah*[1] *savargîyam uttamam âpadyate yathâ*[2] *vâñ*.... *shan-*.... *tan*.... *evampara iti kim vâk* .... *prathama iti kim imâm*.... *uttamah paro yasmâd asâv uttamaparah*

[1] G M O ins *atmanah* [2] G M om

3 *svaraghoshavatparah*[1] *prathamah savargîyam trtîyam âpadyate yathâ*[2] *rdhag*.... *yad*.... *ity âdi svarâç ca ghoshavantaç ca svaraghoshavantah te pare yasmâd asâu*[3] *sa tathoktah*

[1] B om, G M O *svaraparo ghoshavatparaç ca* [2] G M O om [3] G M om

4 *kakud ity asmin grahane 'ntyo varno*[1] *makâraparaç*[2] *cakârâkrshtam savargîyam*[3] *trtîyam âpadyate*[4] *yathâ*[5] *kakud-*....

notices, finally, that the present rule establishes an exception to rule 2 of this chapter

अथ विसर्जनीयः ॥ ५ ॥

5 Now for changes of *visarjanîya*

Departing a little from his stereotyped mode of explanation of *atha*, the commentary declares it in this rule to cause *visarjanîya* to be understood, in the character of that respecting which something is to be enjoined (*lakshya*), in the precepts that follow, and he adds that this understanding is to remain in force as far as rule 10 of the next chapter

रेफमेतेषु ॥ ६ ॥

6 *Visarjanîya* becomes *r* before the classes of sounds last mentioned

The examples are *tad agnir âha* (iv 2 8[1]), and *âçîr ma ûrjam* (iii 2 8[5] O omits *ûrjam*), with the counter-example *agniç ca ma indraç ca me* (iv 7 6[1]) The commentator points out that it is the plural form of the pronoun (*eteshu*, literally 'before those') in this rule that shows the implication of the vowels and sonant consonants, in the character of following causes (*paranimitta*), since those are the only things which have been mentioned above (namely, in rule 3) That is doubtless so, still, the reference must be regarded as an unusually blind one, involving a "frog-leap" (*mandûkapluti*) over two intervening obstacles, of which one is a general heading, that changes entirely the subject under treatment

---

kakud iti kim ya---- evampara iti kim kakut---- makârah paro yasmâd asâu makâraparah uttamapara uttamañ savargîyam (viii 2) *ity asyâ 'pavâdo 'yam*

[1] G M *tikâro* [2] W *makarah* [3] G M O put after *trtiyam* [4] W *prâpyate* [5] G M om

5 *athaçabdo visarjanîyam lakshyatvenâ 'dhikaroti 'ta uttaram yad ucyate*[1] *atha svaraparo yakâram* (ix 10) *ity avadhibhûto 'yam adhikârah*

[1] G M *vakshyamah*

6 [1] *svareshu ghoshavatsu ca*[2] *parato*[3] *visarjanîyo repham âpadyate yathâ*[4] *tad---- âçîr---- eteshv*[5] *iti bahuvacanântasya sarvanâmno*[6] *nirdeçât svaraghoshavatâm paranimittânâm upâdânam*[7] *teshâm eva prakrtatvât eteshv iti kim agniç----*

[1] G M ins *eteshu* [2] G M om [3] O *pareshu* [4] G M O om [5] W B *svareshv* [6] W O *sarvanama*, B *nâmino* [7] G M *nat*

न रेफपरः ॥ ७ ॥

7 But not before *r*

R, though a sonant consonant, and therefore included in the preceding rule, requires a different treatment in the final *visarjanîya* before it What this different treatment is, is pointed out farther on in the chapter (rule 16 seq) The examples here given are *suvo rohâva* (i 7 9[1]), and *ahorâtre* (i 5 9[7] et al W O add *pârçve*, but there is no such collocation of words in the Sanhita, and I suspect the word to be a corrupted reading for *prâviçan*, which follows next at the place referred to)

ह्वार्भार्वार्हार्बिभर्जीगर्कर्नन्तर्विवःसुवःपुनरहर्हः-
प्रातर्वस्तःशमितःसवितःसनुतस्तनुतस्तोतर्होतःपितर्मा-
तर्यष्टरेष्टर्नेष्टस्त्वष्टः ॥ ८ ॥

8 *Visarjanîya* becomes *r* in *hvâh*, *abhâh*, *vâh*, *hâh*, *abibhah*, *ajîgah*, *akah*, *anantah*, *vivah*, *suvah*, *punah*, *aharahah*, *prâtah*, *vastah*, *camitah*, *savitah*, *sanutah*, *stanutah*, *stotah*, *hotah*, *pitah*, *mâtah*, *yashtah*, *eshtah*, *neshtah*, and *tvashtah*

With this rule begins the detail of the cases of an original *r* after *a* and *â*, which is protected and brought to light by a following sonant letter, being treated in quite a different manner from an original *s*, although both *r* and *s* are represented, as finals, by the indifferent *visarjanîya* The commentator points out at the end the rules to which these cases constitute exceptions, namely ix 7,9,10 His illustrative examples are as follows For *hvâh*,

---

7 *rephaparo visarjanîyo repham nâ "padyate yathâ*[1] *suvo ---- ahor-----, ghoshavattvâd rephasya pûrvavidhiprâptih rephah paro yasmâd asâu rephaparah*

[1] G M om

8 [1]*------ eteshu*[1] *visarjanîyo repham âpadyate svaraghoshavatparah*[2] *yathâ*[3] *mâ---- yonâv---- vâr---- mâ me---- ab---- osh---- dev----* [5]*karâvar anudâtte pade*[4] (viii.9) *iti*[5] *vakshyati tenâi 'vâi*[6] *'tad*[7] *api sidhyaty*[8] *apy akârâdi* (i 52) *iti vacanât iti cet mâi 'vam anudâtte kahçabde tad bhavati idam tv anyasvarârtham iti*[9] *yathâ*[10] *arvâ----* [11]*âdyudâttas tv idam*[11] *yajña----- antar anâdyudâtte* (viii 10) *iti vakshyati tasmâd ankârâdi ca*[12] (i 53) *iti vacanât sidhyati iti cet* [13]*mâi 'vam*[13] *anâdyudâtte tad bhavati âdyudâttârtham*[14] [15]*idam grahanam*[15] *ca---- suvar---- punar---- ahar-*

according to W B, *mâ hvâr mitrasya* (i 1 4[1]), but, according to G M O, *mâ hvâr vasûnâm* (i 1 3) I have found the word only in these two sections For *abhâh*, *yonâv abhâr ukhâ* (iv 2 5[2]) For *vâh*, *vâr nâma vo hitam* (v 6 1[3]) For *hâh*, *mâ me pra hâr asti vâ idam* (ii 4 12[3,4] vi 5 1[1 2] only G M have the last two words) the word is found also at ii 4 12[5], 5 2[3,5] For *abibhah*, as the only passage where it occurs (ii 5 1[2]) does not exhibit in *samhitâ* the final *r*, we have the *jatâ*-text quoted, namely *abibhas tam tam abibhar abibhas tam* *Ajîgah*, for the same reason, is treated in the same way in W B O, namely *oshadhîr ajîgar ajîgar oshadhîr oshadhîr ajîgah ajîgar ity ajîgah* (iv 6 7[3]), but G M read simply *oshadhîr ajîgah* For *akah*, *devatrâ 'kar ajakshîrena* (v 1 7[4] G M omit the last word) it is found also at i 3 14[2] twice, 5 2[3] ii 4 9[2], 5 7[1] iii 1 10[3], 4 10[4] iv 1 2[4] v 2 1[4],8[7] vi 4 8[1] As for this *akah*, the commentator supposes the objection raised that rule 9, which teaches that *kah* and *âvah* change *h* to *r* in an unaccented word, combined with rule i 52, which would extend the force of that rule to *kah* with *a* prefixed, is sufficient to cover the cases of its occurrence, without separate mention in the present rule, but he denies the pertinence of the objection, on the ground that the specification here made includes all instances of *akah*, without regard to their accentuation—for example, *ákah* at iv 1 2[4], which is accented on the first syllable, but exhibits *r* in its *jatâ*-reading, *árvâ' 'kar ákar árvâ' 'rvâ' 'kah* For *anantah*, *yajñaparusho 'nantari-tyâi* (v 2 5[6]) A precisely similar objection is suggested to this word also, on the ground of rules viii 10 and i 53 combined, and it is similarly repelled, by reference to the difference of accent *ánantar* has the acute on the first syllable, which rule 10 forbids For *vivah* is given, again in *jatâ*-text, *ca vivar vivaç ca ca vivah vivar iti vivah* (iv 2 8[2], only O has the final repetition of *vivah* the Atharvan reads *vi vah*, as two separate words, in the corres-

---

---- *ahârahar*[16] (viii 13) *ity aningyânto nishidhyate*[17] *evam-rûpasya* [18]*nâ 'yam niyamah*[18] *prâtar*---- *doshâ*---- [19]*çrtañ* ----[19] *deva*---- *ârâc*---- *stanutar*[20] *iti çâkhântare etañ* ---- *hotar*---- *marut*---- *prthivi*---- *agne*---- *açîy'* ---- *neshtah*---- *çivas*---- *svaraghoshavatpara iti kim ab*---- *punas*---- *avarnapûrvas tu lupyate* (ix 9) *iti kvacil lopaprâptih* [21]*atha svaraparo yakâram* (ix 10) *iti kvacid yatvaprâptih okâram ah sarvo 'kâraparah* (ix 7) *iti kvacid otvaprâptih*[21] *tâ etâh prâptîh*[22] *pratisheddhum hvârabhâr-âdyârambhah*

(1) O ---- *eshu*, G M *hvar abhar var hâr ity adi* 2 G M om *svara* 3 G M om 4 W om (5) G M *kar anudâttatvena* 6 O om *eva* 7 W *tad* 8 O puts after *vacanat* 9 G M om, O *api* 10 G M O om (11) W *âdyudâttasva-rarthah*, G M O *ayam* for *idam* 12 O om (13) G M *na*, O om 14 B *âttam*, G M O *attas* (15) G M *tv ayan*, O *tv ayam iti gr-* 16 G M add *suvar* 17 W *dhyeta*, G M *-shedhita ity* (18) G M *ayam nishedhah* (19) B om. 20 G M *san-* (21) O om 22 W G M O *ptih*

ponding passage, iv 1 1) For *suvah*, *suvar asi suvar me yacha* (v 7 6^{2} O omits the last word) the numerous passages in which this word occurs it would be quite useless to rehearse For *punah*, *punar âsadya sadanam* (iv 2 3^{3} O omits the last word) this, too, is of too frequent occurrence to be worth detailed reference For *ahar ahah*, *aharahar havirdhânînâm* (ii 5 6^{3}) the same repetition of *ahah* is found further at i 5 9^{6} twice,[7] ii 5 6^{6} In connection herewith is made the remark that *ahah* when not at the end of a separable compound is the subject of rule 13, below, but that that rule does not apply to a case like the one here in hand For *prâtah*, *prâtar upasadah* (vi 2 3^{3}) *prâtah* is found also at i 4 7 ii 1 2^{5}, 5 6^{3} iii 1 7^{1}, 3 8^{4}, 4 10^{1} vi 4 2^{1} For *vastah*, *doshâvastar dhiyâ vayam* (i 5 6^{2}, p *doshâ-vastah*) also at i 2 14^{4} For *çamitah*, *çrtañ havîsh çamitar iti trishatyâh* (vi 3 10^{1} only G M have the first word, only O the last) For *savitah*, *deva savitar etat te* (iii 2 7^{1}) the word is found also in about a dozen other passages For *sanutah*, *ârâc cid dveshah sanutar yuyotu* (i 7 13^{5}) For *stanutah* we are simply referred to "another text" (*çâkhântara*) but G M read *sanutar* and omit *stanutar* in the rule itself For *stotah*, *etañ stotar etena* (vii 4 20) For *hotah*, *hotar yavishtha sukrato* (i 2 14^{5} O omits the last word) also at i 3 14^{3}, 6 2^{2} iv 3 13^{2} v 1 4^{5} vi 3 8^{2}, 4 3^{3} For *pitah*, resort is had to the *jatâ*-reading, since the only passage (iii 3 9^{1}) in which the word occurs does not bring to view the *r* thus, *marutâm pitah pitar marutâm marutâm pitah* For *mâtah*, *prthivi mâtar mâ mâ hiñsîh* (iii 3 2^{2} O omits the last word) For *yashtah*, *agne yashtar idam namah* (i 1 12) For *eshtah*, again a *jatâ*-reading, *açîy' eshtar eshtar açîyâ 'çîy' eshtah* (i 2 11^{1}) its treatment before the word which follows it in *samhitâ* is the subject of rules 18–22 of this chapter, that of the preceding word, of x 14 For *neshtah*, once more the *jatâ* is drawn upon, *neshtah patnîm patnîm neshtar neshtah patnîm* (vi 5 8^{6}) For *tvashtah*, finally, *çivas tvashtar ihâ" gahi* (iii 1 11^{2} O omits the last word) also at i 3 7^{1}, 10^{1} iii 1 11^{1} vi 3 6^{2}, 11^{2}

The commentary adds a couple of counter-examples, illustrative of the fact that these words show their *r* only before a vowel or sonant consonant they are *abibhas tam bhûtâni* (ii 5 1^{2}), and *punas te mâi 'shâm* (iv 7 14^{3})

करावरनुदात्ते ,पदे ॥ ९ ॥

9 Also in *kah* and *âvah*, in an unaccented word

The cited examples are *mithuyâ kar bhâgadheyam* (i 3 7^{2}), and

---

9 *kah âvah ity etayor visarjanîyah padakâle 'nudâtte*[1] *pade vartamânah svaraghoshavatparo repham âpadyate yathâ*[2] *mith- . . . . suruco . . . . anudâtta iti kim ko . . . .* [3]*âvo . . . .*[3] *evampara iti kim adhi . . . .*

[1] G M *tta* [2] G M om [(3)] O om

suruco vena âvah âvar ity âvah (iv 2 8[2] G M O omit *surucah*) For *âvah* I find no other example, *kah* occurs further at i 4 45[1] ii 2 12[1] As counter-examples, *kò 'sye "çvarâh* (ii 6 7[1]), and *â'vo vâ'jeshu yâm junâ'h* (i 3 13[2] G M omit the last two words, O omits the whole passage) show the necessity of the specification respecting accent, while *adhipâm akah samashtyâi* (vi 1 7[6]) shows that the *r* appears only before a sonant letter This last example, it may be remarked, is brought under the action of the rule by i 52 it would be an example also under the preceding rule, compare what is there said in connection with the cited word *akah*

अन्तरनाद्युदात्ते ॥ १० ॥

10 Also in *antah*, except when accented on the first syllable.

The cited examples are *antár agne rucâ' tvám* (iv 1 9[3], 2 1[5]), *agním antár bharishyántî* (iv 1 3[2] O omits the first word), and *antaryâmè maghavan* (vi 4 6[3] but O omits the example—reasonably enough, since it is given again later in this very comment, in illustration of a special point) It were to no good end to rehearse the other cases of occurrence of so common a word To show the necessity of the restriction respecting accent, the commentator quotes *eshó 'ntó 'ntam manushyàh* (vii 2 7[2]), where we have the noun *ánta*, which the rule was especially constructed to avoid including To prove, again, the continued implication of "followed by a sonant letter," is given *antás te dadhâmi* (i 4 3 and vi 4 6[1 2]) Then the comment proceeds to justify the form in which the restriction respecting accent is made in the rule it might have been said, "when accented on the last syllable," but then the rule would have applied only under those circumstances, whereas now is included the case when the word is not accented at all, as in *antarvedî mithunâ'u* (vii 5 9[4], p *antah-vedî*) and *antaryâmè maghavan* (vi 4 6[3], as above but G M omit) The mode of statement selected, however, it may be remarked, has this inconvenience—that it renders necessary the separate specification, in rule 8, of *anantah*, because that combination, where it occurs, happens to be "accented on the first syllable" (see note to rule 8) It would appear to admit of question, in-

---

10 *antar ity* [1]*asmin pade*[1] *'nâdyudâtte visarjanîyah svaraghoshavatparo repham âpadyate*[2] *yathâ*[3] *antar---- agnim----' antar---- anâdyudâtta iti kim esho---- evampara iti kim antas----* [6]*antodâtta iti vaktavye*[4] *bahusvaratvam bahûpâdânârtham*[5] *anyathâ tv*[7] *antodâttasyâi 'va syât* [6] *antarv---- antary---- âdâv udâtto yasya tad âdyudâttam nâ "dyudâttam anâdyudâttam tasmin*

(1) G M *etasmin* [2] G M *âpnoti* [3] G M om [4] G M om [5] W O *thah* (6) B om [7] G M *hy*

deed, whether *ânantah* was not fairly included in the present rule, since the *antah* part of it, at any rate, is not "accented on the first," but the treatise chooses to avoid so nice a question of interpretation, and to take the safe side

आवृत्परः ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also a *visarjanîya* followed by *âvrt*

The quoted examples are *jinvar âvrt svâhâ* and *ugnar âvrt svâhâ* (both ii 4 7[1] B has *bhîmar* for *ugnar*, O reads in each case *âvrth*, according to the requirements of rule xiv 12) Other instances in the same and following divisions of the same section are *bhîmar âvrt*, *tveshar âvrt*, *çrutar âvrt*, and *bhûtar âvrt* The anomalous combination does not occur elsewhere

इतिपरो ऽपि ॥ १२ ॥

12 And likewise when *iti* follows

The word *api* in this rule, we are told, brings forward the implication of "a *visarjanîya* followed by *âvrt*" According to the commentator's exposition, further, the rule is intended to apply to the *jatâ* repetition of *çrutah* with its predecessor *iti* as, *iti çrutah çrutar itî 'ti çrutah* (ii 4 7[2]) Nor do I see of what other interpretation it is capable, although it seems strange that the irregular conversion of *h* into *r* should be retained in the *jatâ*-reading of this word only, and not of the others, where repeated with their respective predecessors It is clearly implied that we are to read, for example, in the first case falling under the preceding rule, *varshan jinvo jinvo varshan varshan jinvah*

As counter-example, showing the necessity of the implication signified by *api*, we receive *rtubhir havanaçrutah* (ii 4 14[5] G M O omit the first word, G M add *havam*, but no such word follows in the Sanhitâ, and the addition is doubtless a copyist's error—possibly growing out of the attempt to repeat the compound, in its *pada* or *jatâ* form) Here both the *pada*-text (as the word is a compound) and the *jatâ* (as it stands before a pause) would read *havanaçruta iti havana-çrutah*, the ordinary *sandhi* being made of *çrutah* and *iti*

अकारहःसुवर्निंग्यान्तः ॥ १३ ॥

---

11 *âvrd ity evamparo visarjanîyo repham âpnoti jinv-.... ugn-....*

12 *apiçabda âvrtparam*[1] *visarjanîyam anvâdiçati asâu visarjanîya itiparo repham âpnoti iti çr-.... anvâdeçah kimarthah rtu-.... itih*[2] *paro yasmâd asâv itiparah*

[1] W O *-paro*, G M *-para* [2] W B *iti*, O *itiçabdah*

13 Also in *ahâh*, *ahah*, and *suvah*, except at the end of a separable word

There is a well-established difference of reading in the text itself of this rule T and W read the last word *anîngyântâh*, as plural, to agree with the three words mentioned, or else with the three cases of *visarjanîya* which they present, and at the beginning of the comment, both in W and in O, is seen an attempt to explain the word as a plural—not, however, consistently carried out in either As both readings are equally acceptable, I have adopted the one which is best supported

The examples given in illustration of the rule are *ahâr jâtavedâ vicarshanih* (iii 2 5[4] O omits the last word), *ahar mânsena* (v 7 20 but G M substitute *aharbhâjo vâi*, vii 4 5[1]), and *suvar devâñ aganma* (i 7 9[2] O omits the last word) and, as counter examples, first, to show that the *h* in the words specified, when they stand as final members of compounds, is treated in the usual manner, *abhipûrvam tryahâ bhavanti* (vii 3 9[2] et al, p *tri-ahâh* O omits the first word), *pratyañ tryaho bhavati* (vii 3 5[3] et al, p *tri-ahah* but B has dropped out the whole example, and G M O substitute, O with omission of the first word, *pratyañ shadaho bhavati*, vii 4 2[5]), and *devasuva stha te* (i 8 10[2] but W B O give simply the *pada*-reading of *devasuvah*, namely *devasuva iti deva-suvah*, since thus alone is the word put into circumstances which show its *h* not to be convertible into *r*), and second, to show that the conversion takes place only before sonant letters, *prâyanîyam ahas tasmât* (vii 2 8[1] O omits the first word), and *suvaç ca mûrdhâ ca* (i 7 9[1] and iv 7 11[2])

The commentator then proceeds to give an explanation, so far as *ahâh* is concerned, respecting the virtual intent of the rule, which, he says, is meant to establish an exception for that word when the final member of a compound, since the inclusion of *hâh* among the words cited in rule 8 would, under the operation of the often-quoted rule i 52, be authority sufficient for turning *ahâh* into *ahâr* before a sonant letter Upon this he next imagines the objection to be raised, that the reading in this rule also, as well as the other, should have been *hâh*, *ahâh* being then included along with it according to the principle referred to, and thus the liability to reproach for overdoing the explicitness of the rule would be avoid

---

13. *ahâh ahah suvah eteshu*[1] *visarjanîyo*[2] *'ningyântah*[3] *svaraghoshavatparo repham âpnoti*[4] *yathâ*[5] *ahâr*.. . *ahar*.... *suvar*.... *aningyânta iti kim abhip* .... *praty-* ... *dev-* .... *evampara iti kim prây-*.... *suvaç-*.... *hvârabhâi* (viii 8) [6] *âdisûtre hâr ity anena grahanenâ 'hâhçabdasyâ 'py akârâdi* (i 52) *iti vacanâd rephasiddhâu satyâm atra punarvacanam ingyântasyâ 'hâhçabdasya pratishedhârtham nanv atrâi 'va*[7] *hâr iti vaktavyam apy akârâdi* (i 52) *iti vacanena kâryasiddheh na tu tadgâuravâpatteh*[8] *iti cet mâi 'vam aning*

ed But he replies, reasonably enough, that, as the rule says "when not the final member of a separable word," it is to be inferred that the words specified do occur as such members and with *hâh* that is not the case, wherefore the distinction would be meaningless with reference to *hâh* And it would be a poor enough side to take, and altogether unworthy of approval, to give a direction which did not apply to a word itself, but only to that word with *a* prefixed Hence the quotation is made in proper form

Just as long a discussion might have been raised with equal reason over *ahah* and *suvah*, both of which are also included in the former rule So far as *ahah* is concerned, indeed, it is easy to see that this is the general rule, applying to the cases of occurrence of that word in the main, with a specific restriction, and that *ahar-ahah* in rule 8 is a sort of exception in advance, made for a single case which would otherwise fall under this restriction (since, in *ahah-ahah*, the second *ahah* is in fact the final member of a compound) But I am unable to discover any justification of the way in which *suvah* is treated it is made the subject of two general rules, to the one of which a needed restriction is attached, to the other, not For *ahâh* and *suvah*, the present rule should, it seems, have taken distinctly the form of an exception merely *nâ 'hâh-suvar iñgyântâu,* 'not, however, *ahâh* and *suvah*, when final members of compounds,' and *ahah* should have been separately treated, or else included with them and a further counter-exception added

न भिभ्यांपरः ॥ १४ ॥

14 Not, however, when followed by *bhih* or *bhyâm*

There is violation of the ordinary usage of the Prâtiçâkhya in this rule also The only one of the words mentioned in the preceding rule which is found with the case-endings *bhih* and *bhyâm* following it is *ahah,* and hence, to it alone the present precept applies We should expect it, therefore, in accordance with the principle of which i 58 is an expression, to have been placed last in the trio of which it forms a member The commentator does not remark upon the irregularity, but simply points out that the

---

yânta ity ukter[9] *iñgyântatvam*[10] *iti*[11] *sambhâvanîyam tac ca hâr ity evamrûpe*[12] *grahane nâ 'stî 'ty*[13] *atre 'dam viçeshanam anarthakam syât tathâ 'py*[14] *evamrûpe mâ bhûd iti*[15] [16]*kim tv*[16] *akârâditve bhavatî 'ti jaghanyah pakshah na tu saralah iti sûtre*[17] *'hâr*[18] *iti grahanam upayujyate*

[1] O *eshu padeshu* [2] W *-yâ* [3] W *aningyântah*, O *-ta* [4] O *apnuvanti* [5] G M O om [6] G M ins *ity.* [7] G M *'vâ.* [8] O *tatra gauravadoshâp*, G M *tatra gâugavadeshop* [9] W *ukten*, G M O *ukte* [10] G M *ântam* [11] G M O *api* [12] G M O *-pa.* [13] W om *iti* [14] G M O *sati* a better reading [15] O om (16) G M om, O *kim tv apy* [17] G M O *sutaram* [18] MSS *ahar*

circumstances of the case restrict the application of the rule to *ahah*, and gives as examples *uttarâir ahobhiç caranti* (vii 5 1⁴ G M O omit the last word), and *çam ahobhyâm iti ni nayati* (vi 3 9¹)

अंह्रश्च सर्वेषाम् ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also not in *añhah*, as all agree

Some authorities, namely, the commentator informs us, accept this word as containing an *anusvâra*, others not, but all alike regard it as an exception under rule 13 (and therefore not liable to have its final *visarjanîya* converted into *r* under any circumstances) Those who accept the *anusvâra* still regard the word as falling under the action of rule 13, in virtue of the principle "a nose-sound occurring in the interior of a word is no bar to the application of a rule, hence it performs the offices of letters while itself only a quality" (if this be, in fact, the meaning of the second line of the verse, of which I am by no means confident, the readings of the manuscripts are here somewhat discordant, without being mutually explanatory) The first words of this verse were quoted in the comment on rule i 1, in connection with the discussion as to whether *anusvâra* was a concrete thing or a quality (see p 8), and were credited to the Çikshâ—which, however, in the form in which we now possess it, neither contains such a passage, nor seems to furnish a connection in which it should naturally be introduced I should question the sober verity of the considerations whereby the commentator tries to justify the rule It is hardly credible that *âñhah* and *ahah* should be fairly identified by any authorities And *anusvâra* is not a *nâsikya*, but an *anunâsika*, in the view of this treatise everywhere It might be bet-

14 *sâmnidhyena*[1] *labdhah*[2] *pûrvasûtrokto visarjanîyo* [3] *bhirbhyâm* [4] *evamparo*[5] *na repham âpnoti arthâd ahar ity atra visarjanîyah parigrhyate itaratrasthitasyâi 'vamparatvâbhâvât yathâ utt- ... çam- ...*

[1] G M O *dhyâl* [2] W *labhyah* [3] W ins *na* [4] O ins *ity* [5] G M *paro*

15 *cakâro* [1]*'nishedham âkarshati*[1] *añha ity asmin*[2] *grahane visarjanîyo na repham âpnoti aharahar* (viii 13) *iti prâptih atra*[3] *grahane kecid anusvâram ichanti* [4]*kecin ne 'chanti sarveshâm*[4] *teshâm esha*[5] *nishedho bhavati anusvâram ichadbhir api prâptir evam pratipâdyate*[6]

vidher madhyasthanâsikyo na virodho[7] [8]*bhavet smrtah*[8]
tasmât karoti[9] *kâryâni varnânâm* [10]*dharma eva*[10] *tu*
iti yathâ[11] *añha- ... añho- ...*

(1) G M O *-dhâkarshakah* [2] G M *etasmin* [3] O *asmin* (4) G M om [5] G M *eva* [6] G M *pady-* [7] B *dhi* (8) B *bhavet satah*, G M *bhaved yatah* [9] B G M *kurvanti* (10) W *dharmanas* [11] G M om

ter to regard the specific exception of *añhah* as simply a sort of supererogatory effort at extreme explicitness, intended to guard against the confusion with *ahah*, even by a blunderer, of another word which was, indeed, definitely different from it, but different by only so inconspicuous an element as the nasalization of a vowel.

The illustrative examples are *añha indram evâ 'ñhomucam* (ii 2 7[4]: but O writes ---- *eva añhomucam*, as if the latter word were a separate citation: it is found in other passages), and *añhomuce pra bharema* (i 6 12[3]: but O substitutes *añhomuce purodâçam*, ii 2 7[4]).

अनवर्णपूर्वस्तु रेफपरो लुप्यते ॥ १६ ॥

16. But, when not preceded by an *a* vowel, *visarjanîya* followed by *r* is omitted.

The commentator's example in illustration of the action of this rule is *revatî ramadhvam* (i 3 7[1] et al., p. *revatîh*), and he adds as counter-examples, first, to show the necessity of the restriction "not preceded by an *a*-vowel," *yo rudro agnâu* (v 5 9[3]), and again, to show that the omission takes place only before a *r*, *revatîr nah sadhamâdah* (ii 2 12[8], 4 14[4]). This exhausts the evident intent of the rule: the *tu*, 'but,' which the latter contains, merely indicates the transition to a new and diverse subject; it intimates no distinction between the classes of cases in which the *visarjanîya* represents a *s* on the one hand and an original *r* on the other, and all the cases of final *ah* and *âh* are left to be treated alike, as prescribed by the rules given hereafter (ix. 7–10)—*ah* being changed to *o*, and *âh* to *â*. This truly represents the usage of the Sanhitâ: the latter does not contain (if the special case which forms the subject of rules 18–22, below, be excepted) a single instance of *ah* converted into *â* before *r*: the occurrence before *r* of *ah* standing for original *ar* is very rare, and the product is always *o*: besides the cases of *ahorâtre* (*pada*-text, *ahah râtre*), I have

---

16. *avarṇâd anyasvarapûrvo rephaparo visarjanîyo lupyate: yathâ*[1] *rev----: evampûrva iti kim: yo----: evampara iti kim: rev----: tuçabdârambhâd avarṇapûrvo 'pi hvâr abhâr* (viii 8) *âdînâm visargo lupyate pûrvasvaraç ca dîrgham âpadyate: yathâ*[2] *rukmo----: tarhi suvo----: ity atra lopadîrghâu kim na syâtâm: dviruktatvâd iti brûmah: tat katham hvârabhâr* (viii 8) *âdisutre*[3] *ahâr ahahsuvar* (viii 13) *ity atra ca: nanv ahorâtre ity atra katham otvam: anyârthena grahanasâmarthyene 'ti brûmah: tat*[4] *katham ahorâtre dhrtavrate*[5] (iv 11) *ity evamrûpasâmyâd*[6] *ahorâtrâbhyâm ahorâtrayor*[7] *ity âdi vijñeyam*[8] [9]*evam ced adhishavane* (iv 11) *iti grahanasâmarthyenâi 'va*[9] [10]*shatve siddhe*[11] [12] *na dhipûrve* (vi 11) *iti* [13]*nishedhanishedhena virodhah*[13] *satyam sa-*

only found four instances of *suvah* before forms of *ruh*, namely *suvo ruhânâh* (iv 1 2⁴, 7 13¹), *suvo rohâva* (i 7 9¹), and *suvo rokshyâmi* (i 7 9¹) The other Prâtiçâkhyas (Rik Pr iv 9, r 28,29, Vâj Pr iv 34, Ath Pr ii 19, iii 20) convert *ah* to *â* in like circumstances, and at least the Rik and Atharvan afford several instances of the *sandhi*

So much for the rule and its meaning The commentator, unfortunately, has found occasion to give it a forced and false interpretation, it leads him into a nest of difficulties, through which he flounders as best he can, coming out at the end with much discredit There happens to be a single passage (or, if there be another, I have not noticed it) where a word with original final *r* follows in the Sanhitâ a word beginning with *r*—namely *rukmo antah* (iv 1 10⁴ ⁵, 6 5², 7 12³)—and, of course, in the inversions of the *jatâ*-text, comes to stand before its predecessor The accepted *jatâ*-reading, it appears (as given in full by the commentator), is *rukmo antar antâ rukmo rukmo antah*, the analogy of the Rik and Atharvan usage being followed in the treatment of *antah* In order, now, to find authority for this reading, the commentator declares that *tu*, 'but,' in the rule signifies that, even when preceded by an *a*-vowel, the words specified in rule 8 and its successors lose their *visarjanîya* and lengthen the preceding vowel This is an attribution of portentous pregnancy of meaning to the particle such as is not very infrequently made, rarely with more evident falsity than here The objection is immediately suggested—why, in that case, does not *suvah* in *suvo rohâva* (i 7 9¹) lose its *h* and lengthen its *a*? Because, is the acute reply, it has been mentioned twice, once in rule 8, and once in rule 13 What possible connection is to be discovered between this repetition and the use to which he would fain put it, he does not give himself the trouble to inform us he takes care to raise only such difficulties as he conceives himself able to remove The next which it pleases him to evoke is—how is the *o* of *ahorâtre* to be explained? We rather

---

vaçabdasyâ 'dhishavane iti grahanasâmarthyena[10] *shatvam sidhyatu sthânaçabdasya katham sidhyet grahanâdisâmarthyâbhâvât*[14] *tasmât tadartham*[15] *tâvat*[16] *sûtram sârthakam iti* [17]*tadartham ca drashtavyam*[17] *tadartham ce*[18] *'ti gudajihvikânyâyah*[19] *tathâ hi grahanasâmarthyâd*[20] *iti*[21] *gamanikâmâtram*[22] *kanthoktis tu viçeshah tatah savaçabdârtham*[23] *sûtram iti bhâvah*[24]

avarnâd anyo 'navarnah asâu pûrvo yasmât sa tathoktah rephah paro yasmâd asâu rephaparah

[1] B G M O om [2] W B G M om [3] W B ins *ahn ahar iti* [4] W B O om [5] O *adhishavane* [6] G M *pragrahe evam upasamarthyad* [7] G M *tre* [8] B *jñeyam* (9) O *nanu anyarthena grahanenai 'va* (10) G M om [11] O *siddhih* [12] B ins *nishiddhe* (13) O *shatvanishedhanishedho na vidheyah*, B *nishedho na iti virodhah* [14] B *nasam-* [15] B *artham*, G M *tadavastham* [16] G M *vâ tat* (17) G M O *samtoshtavyam* [18] G M *ve* [19] G M *gulu* [20] O *thyam* [21] O om, G M *i* [22] G M *kam* [23] G M *savasthanaçab*, O adds *api* [24] G M *gâvah*

expect to hear him reply—because *ahah* also is twice mentioned, in the same two rules with *suvah* But no, we do injustice to the tenderness of his exegetical conscience, in supposing him capable of such gross arbitrariness of interpretation, when in rule 8, instead of *ahah*, *aharahah* is read He alleges instead the competency of a form cited for another purpose (compare Rik Pr i.13, r liv,55) we have read in rule iv 11 *ahorâtre*, where the *pragrahas* are under treatment, and this suffices, by analogy of form, to determine the reading also of *ahorâtrâbhyâm* and *ahorâtrayoh* If this be so, it is next retorted, then, as the *sh* of *adhishavane*, which is cited in the same rule, is assured by the citation itself, rule vi 11, prescribing the *sh*, in the way of an exception to an exception, is out of order That is true, the commentator confesses but, granting that the *sh* of *sava* is established by the previous mention of *adhishavane*, how is that of *sthânu*, the other word specified in the same rule, established? the rule is therefore to be deemed of force so far as relates to that word, and to be regarded as intended for it Of what follows, not all is clear to me it appears that the rule is, after all, defended as it stands, on "the principle of sugar-candy and little tongue" (i e as merely giving more than is absolutely required of what one cannot receive too much of, as the palate of candy— ?) for to establish the reading on the authority of a previous citation is only doing just what will answer (? *gamanikâ* occurs in only one other passage, the comment on i 18, and I find nowhere anything that explains its use), while specific mention is a distinction, hence the rule has a meaning as applied to *sava* also such is the understanding

The commentator might much better, surely, have acknowledged that his text-book had omitted to provide for the special case of *jatâ*-reading which has caused all this trouble, than have forced it within the contemplation of the rules at such cost

दीर्घं च पूर्वः ॥१७॥

17 And the preceding vowel is made long

The "and" (*ca*) in the rule is declared to signify that the lengthening of the vowel takes place only when *visarjanîya* has been omitted The cited examples are *rurû râudrah* (v 5 19), *tittirî rohit* (v 5 16), and *vishnû rûpam krtvâ* (vi 2 4[2] only G M have the last word) As was noticed in the comment upon the preceding rule, there is no such case of *ah* changed to *â* before *r*, except the one forming the special subject of the following rules

---

* 17 *tasmâd rephaparavisarjanîyâl luptât pûrvo 'pi[1] yah svaro hrasvah sa ca dîrgham âpadyate yathâ[2] rurû---- titti---- vishnû---- yadâ[3] visarjanîyasya lopas tadâi 'va dîrghatvam yathâ syâd ity evamarthaç caçabdah*

[1] O om [2] G M om [3] G M O ins *tasya*

एष्टश्च ॥ १८ ॥

18 As also, in *eshtah*

This word has been already mentioned, in rule 8, as one of those whose final *h* is liable to become *r* It is here made the further subject of a special rule, because it is the only case in the Sanhitâ of *ah* changed to *â* before *r* (see the note to rule 16) The passage in which it occurs is *eshtâ râyah* (i 2 11[1] and vi 2 2[6])

We have seen, however, that the commentator has felt obliged to give a false interpretation to rule 16, and one which renders superfluous the present rule, as applying to a case already included under that one He is well aware of the objection to his interpretation thence arising, and himself points out that *eshtâ râyo râya eshtar eshtâ râyah* (only W gives this) is a case analogous with *rukmo antar antâ rukmo rukmo antah* (W B omit the last two words), and that the loss of *h* and lengthening of *a* in *eshtah* is an effect of the *tu* in rule 16, but he does what he can toward removing the objection by alleging that the detail of discordant opinions which is to follow (in the next four rules) renders it more desirable to cite the case specially, in order that it may be understood to what those opinions apply This is a tolerably ingenious subterfuge—but, after all, only a subterfuge

नैकेषाम् ॥ १९ ॥

19 Not so, according to some authorities

The commentator gives two alternative explanations of this rule—both, however, as he notices, leading to the same reading of the phrase under question Vararuci, namely, holds that, in the view of some, the rule denies the conversion of *h* to *r* in *eshtah*, and therefore also the prolongation of the *a*, whence, by the general rule ix 8, the word would become *eshto* (in analogy with all the other cases in the text of *ah* before *r*) Mâhisheya, however, understands that some are said to deny that the *h* of *eshtah* is liable to conversion into *r* before another *r*—that is to say, he makes the rule establish so far an exception under rule 8 rather than rule

18 *eshtar ity asmin grahane visarjanîyo rephaparo*[1] *'varnapûrvo 'pi*[2] *lupyate* [3] *yathâ*[4] *eshtâ ----* [5]*caçabdo lopadîrghayor âkarshakah*[5] *nanv etad anupapannam hvâi abhâr* (viii 8) *âdyantahpâtitvâd eshtar ity asya* [6]*eshtâ ----* [6] *rukmo ---- itivat*[7] *anavarnapûrvas tu* (viii 16) *ity atra tuçabdena*[8] *lopadîrghasiddhâu*[9]. [10]*mâi 'vam*[10] *vakshyamânamatabhedâçrayatvajñâpanâya grhîtam etad upapannataram iti parihârah*

[1] W B *rephah* [2] O om [3] G. M ins *pûrvaç ca dirghah* [4] G M om. [(5)] G M *ghâv akarshati*, and put at the beginning [(6)] B G M O om [7] W *iti*, G M *iti padam* [8] G M *çabde* [9] B *-rhaçruteh*, G M O *ddhe* [(10)] W B O om

18 There can be little question that Vararuci's explanation is the true one

In rule 21, below, we have yet another mode taught of arriving at the same result as regards the reading

द्वावुत्तमोत्तरीयस्य रेफम् ॥ २० ॥

20 According to Uttamottarîya, two become *r*

Here, again, there are two interpretations, Vararuci giving one, Mâhisheya the other The former says that, in the opinion of the specified authority (*çâkhin*, 'holder of a *çâkhâ* or recension of the sacred text'), the *visarjanîya* of *eshtah* and the following *r* both become *r*—that is, as I should think it ought to mean, both fuse together into a single *r* thus, *eshtarâyah*—but none of the manuscripts give this reading in illustrating the case see the various readings below Mâhisheya, on the other hand, regards the individual referred to as owning the portentous name Dvâvuttamottarîya, and as holding that the *h* of *eshtah* becomes *r* before *r*, making *eshtar râyah*

Vararuci here maintains, in my opinion, his usual superiority over Mâhisheya, as regards both the plausibility of the name assumed and the admissibility of the reading taught, and I have accordingly made my translation conform with his interpretation

It is interesting to note the uncertainty of the tradition within reach of the commentators as to the personality of the authorities quoted by the Pratiçâkhya

सांकृत्यस्योकारम् ॥ २१ ॥

21 According to Sâmkrtya, the *visarjanîya* becomes *u*

And this *u*, by x 5, unites with the preceding *a* to form *o*, so that the reading of the passage is *eshto râyah*, as it is according

---

19 *ekeshâm mata eshtar iti visarjanîyo rephaparo na lupyate ata eva pûrvasvaradîrghâbhâvaç ca kim tu ghoshavatparaç ca* (ix 8) [1]*ity otvam*[1] *yathâ eshto râyah vararucivíracitam etat*[2] *mâhisheyabhâshitam tv*[3] *evam eshtar iti visarjanîyo rephaparo* [4]*repham nâ*[5] [']*padyata iti*[4] *siddharûpam ubhayoh samânam*

(1) W om [2] G M om [3] G M *ca* (4) G M *na repham âpnoti* [5] O om *na*

20 *uttamottarîyasya çâkhino*[1] *mata eshtar iti visarjanîyas*[2] *tatparo rephaç ca dvâv etâu repham âpadyete yathâ eshtar*[3] *râyah ayam artho vâraracoktah*[4] *mâhisheyoktas tu dvâvuttamottarîya iti kasya cin nâma tanmata eshtar*[5] *iti visarjanîyo rephaparo repham âpadyate* [6] *eshtar*[7] *râya iti*[8]

(1) O *nor* [2] G M *-yaç ca* [3] B G M *-tâ*, O *-târ* [4] W B O *var-* [5] W B *eshtâ râya.* [6] O ins *yathâ* [7] B G M *-tâ* [8] G M O om

to the "some authorities" quoted in rule 19, above. This is pointed out by the commentator, who, however, declares that the reference to Sâmkrtya in a separate place shows that he is not one of the people there spoken of. B. specifies (probably by a copyist's blunder) that the exposition given of the meaning of the rule is to be credited to Mâhisheya.

उख्यस्य सपूर्वः ॥ २२ ॥

22. And, according to Ukhya, along with the preceding letter.

That is, *eshtar* becomes *eshtu*, the *h* and its predecessor *a* coalescing into *u*. This is the only exposition given by W. and O. But G. M. and B., strangely agreeing for once to differ from the rest, ascribe this understanding of the meaning of the rule to Mâhisheya, and report Vararuci as holding it to signify that the *h* of *eshtah*, with its predecessor, becomes *r*. This last version of the *sandhi* seems little better than nonsense, and neither of the MSS. gives a reading to correspond.

The commentator declares, finally, that, in this net-work of alternative views, the first rule only (viii. 18) is approved. In accordance herewith is the reading of the edited text and of my manuscript, *eshtâ râyah*.

The most interesting circumstance connected with this waste of half a dozen rules over the reading of a single word, is the indication afforded of the anomalousness of the combination as a phenomenon belonging to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, while it is in other Vedic texts a natural and usual thing.

कखपकारपरः षमकारपूर्वः समवग्रहः ॥ २३ ॥

---

21. *sâmkrtyasya mata* eshtar *iti visarjanîyo rephapara ukâram âpadyate*[1] *tata*[2] *uvarnapara* okâram (x. 5) *ity otvam yathâ*[3] eshto râyah *asya ca nâi* 'keshâm (viii. 18) *ity asya*[4] *deçabhedâd bhedah siddhodâharanam*[5] *samânam*.

[1] B. adds *iti mâhisheyoktam*. [2] G. M. om. [3] W. B. G. M. om. [4] G. M. O. ins. *ca*. [5] G. M. O. ins. *tu*.

22. *ukhyasya mate rephapara*[1] eshtar *iti visarjanîyah pûrvavarnena saho 'kâram âpadyate* [2]*iti mâhisheyoktam*[2] *yathâ*[3] eshtu[4] râyah [5]*vârarucoktam*[6] *tu* eshtar *iti visarjanîyo rephaparah pûrvena saha repham âpadyata iti*[7] *yathâ*[8] [9]eshtâ[10] râyah[5,9] *pûrvena saha vartata iti sapûrvah*.

asmin vikalpajâle[11] *prathamam* eshtaç ca (viii. 18) *iti sûtram eve 'shtam*.

[1] G. M. om.; O. puts after *iti*. (2) W. om.; O. *iti*. [3] G. M. om. [4] B. *-to*; G. M. *ta*. (5) W. O. om. [6] B. *var-*. [7] G. M. om. [8] G. M. om. (9) M. om. [10] B. *-trâ*. [11] W. *-jâte*.

23 At the end of the former member of a compound, before *k*, *kh*, or *p*, *visarjanîya* becomes *sh*—or *s*, if preceded by *a*

The commentator notes the fact that, as a different following occasion is here introduced, the implication "followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant," which has so long been in force (namely, since rule 3 of this chapter), comes to an end His illustrative examples are *atho havishkrtânâm eva* (vi 4 3[3] O omits *eva*), *grasitam nishkhidati* (vi.1 9[1] O omits the first word), *bahishpavamâna upasadyah* (vi 4 9[2] O omits the last word), *namaskârâir evâi 'nam* (v 5 7[4] O omits *enam*), and *pathaspathah paripatim* (i.1 14[2] O omits the last word) As counter-example, to show that the *h* must end the first member of a compound, not an independent word, we have *pushpâvatîh prasûvatîh* (iv 2 6[1]), and *namah pitrbhyo abhi* (iii.2 8[3] only G M have *abhi*)

This is a general rule, applying to almost all the compounds in the Sanhitâ which show a final *h* before an initial *k*, *kh*, or *p* of the second member A few exceptions are mentioned farther on (rules 32,33)

आविर्निरिडःशश्वतोऽपसोदेवरिषोऽंहसोऽतिदिवोवि-श्वतोऽश्मनस्तमसः ॥ २४ ॥

24 Also in *âvih*, *nih*, *idah*, *çacvatah*, *apasah*, *deva rishah*, *añhasah*, *ati divah*, *viçvatah*, *açmanah*, and *tamasah*

This rule, the commentator remarks, relates to words which are not first members of compounds His examples are for *âvih*, *âvish krnushva* (i.2 14[2]) For *nih*, *ghrtam nish pibati* (ii.3 11[5])

---

23 *atra paranimittaviçeshanâd*[1] *etatparyantâ*[2] *svaraghoshavatparânuvrttir*[3] *mantavyâ avagrahântavartî*[4] *visarjanîyah kakârakhakârapakâraparah shakâram âpadyate akârapûrvaç cet sakâram yathâ*[5] *atho---- gras---- bahish---- namas---- pathas---- avagraha iti kim push---- namah---- kakâraç ca khakâraç ca pakâraç ca kakhapakârâh te*[6] *pare*[7] *yasmâd asâu*[8] *tathoktah akârah pûrvo yasmâd asâv akârapûrvah*

[1] G M *-shâd* [2] W *etavatp-* [3] G M *-paratvân-* [4] W *-havatara*, B *-ha*, G M *-havarti* [5] G M om [6] O *ete* [7] G M *parâ* [8] G M O *sa*

24 [1]*------ eshu*[1] *visarjanîyah kakhapakâraparo* [2] *yathâvihitam*[3] *bhajate yathâ*[4] *âvish----· ghrtam---- idas---- çaçv---- apasas---- uror----: deve 'ti kim · sa---- añhasas---- ati---- atî 'ti kim divah---- viçv---- tvam ---- ud----*

anavagrahârtho 'yam ârambhah.

(1) G M *âvirâdishu vidyamâno* [2] G M ins. *hi shakaram akârapûrvaç cet sakâram iti* [3] G *-thâsamh-* [4] G M O om

of *nish* before *p*, I find besides only *nish padyeran* (vii 3 10²), before *kh*, *nish khidati* (ii.2 10⁵), before *k*, the cases are more numerous, with forms of *krî* (e g v 5 7²), and *kram* (vi 4 10² ³ doubtless, the separation of the divisions prevents the exhibition of the *sandhi*), cases of *nih* with accented forms of verbs in *k* are yet more frequent, but come under the preceding rule, not this one For *idah*, *idas pade sam idhyase* (ii 6 11⁴ and iv 4 4⁴ O omits the last two words) on the other hand, we have *idâyâh pade* at vi 1 8² For *çaçvatah*, *çaçvatas kar haste* (ii 2.12¹) For *apasah*, *apasas pâre asya* (iii 2 11² O omits *asya*) For *deva rishah*, *uror â no deva rishas pâhi* (i 4 45² O omits to *deva*), with *sa rishah pâtu naktam* (i 2 14⁷, 5 11¹ ²) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after *deva* For *aṅhasah*, *aṅhasas pâtu vâyuh* (iii 2 4³ only O has *vâyuh*) another case is found in the same division, *aṅhasas pâtam* For *ati divah*, *ati divas pâhi samâvavṛtran* (i 8 14² G M O omit after *pâhi*), with *divah pṛshṭhaṅ suvar gatvâ miçrâh* (iv 6 5¹ only B has the last word, O omits the last three) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after *ati* For *viçvatah*, *viçvatas pari havâmahe* (i 6 12¹ G M omit the last word) other cases occur at i 5 3³ ii 1 11¹, 3 14¹ iii 1 11⁴ iv 2 1³,3⁴, 3 13⁸ (in the various repetitions of only two phrases, always before *pari*), and, as first member of a compound, hence falling under the preceding rule, at iv 6 2⁴ an exception is noted in a later rule (viii 32) For *açmanah*, *tvam açmanas pari* (iv 1 2⁵) For *tamasah*, *ud vayam tamasas pari paçyantah* (iv 1 7⁴ and v 1 8⁶ only O has the last word, and it omits the first two)

कृधिपिन्वपथेपरः ॥ २५ ॥

25 Also before *kṛdhi*, *pinva*, and *pathe*

The examples are *uru nas kṛdhi* (ii 6 11³), *apas pinva* (iv 3 4³), and *saprathâ namas pathe* (iv 7 13² G M omit the first word) For *pinva* and *pathe* I find no further examples, but *s* before *kṛdhi* occurs also at i.4 2 (where the edition has the false reading *h*), 3 · iv 2 9⁴, 5 10² v 7 6³,⁴ vi 3 2², 4 5⁴.

न सक्रघकारपरे ॥ २६ ॥

26 But not when *s*, *kr*, or *gh* follows

---

25 ------ *evamparo visarjanîyo yathâvidhim*¹ *bhajate yathâ*². *uru*---- *apas*---- *sapr*----

¹ O *vihitam* ² G M O om

26 *sakraghe*¹ *'ty evampare sati kṛdhyâdâu*² *visarjanîyo yathâvihitam*³ *nâ ''padyate yathâ*⁴ *tân*---- *çam*--*-- *rephena kim*· *uta*---- *uru*----

¹ W adds *kâre sati* ² O *-âdi* ³ G M *-vidhim* ⁴ W B G M om

By its terms, the rule means that the prescription of the preceding rule becomes void when either of the words there mentioned is followed as here specified, but the cases of its application, so far as I am aware, all concern *krdhi* The commentator's illustrations are *tân ma âmanasah krdhi svâhâ* (ii 3 9[1] only W has the first two words, and it omits the last one), *çam ca nah krdhi kratve dakshâya* (iii 3 11[4] O omits the last word), and *uru kshayâya nah krdhi ghrtam ghrtayone* (i.3 4[1] G M O omit the last word), and to the second of these there is a counter-example, *uta no mayas krdhi kshayadvîrâya* (iv 5 10[2]), to show that only *kr*, not *k* alone, gives occasion for retention of the *h* The words *âmanasah krdhi svâhâ* occur again at ii 3 9[2] I find no other cases to be specified in addition to those quoted by the commentator

पत्नीवेपतीपतेपतयेपतिष्पतिंपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27 Also before *patnî ve*, *patî*, *pate*, *pataye*, *patih*, and *patim*

The examples are first, *brahmanas patnî vedim* (iii 5 6[1]), with a counter-example, to show that the word *patnî* must be followed by *ve*, *retodhâh patnî va ity âha* (vi 5 8[4] but O reads *indriyâvatah patnîvantam*, i.4 27), further, *çubhas patî idam aham* (iii 2 10[2] only O has *aham*), *vâstosh pate prati* (iii 4 10[1]), *pra cyavasva bhuvas pate* (i.2 9 and vi 1 11[4]), *vâcas pataye pavasva* (i 4 2), *vâcas patir vâcam* (i 7 7[1]), and *vâcas patim viçvakarmânam ûtaye* (iv 6 2[5] G M O omit the last word) The inquiry is now raised, why it was necessary to give all these words in detail, instead of comprehending them all in *pat*, and in reply is quoted the passage *divam gacha suvah pata* (iv 1 10[5] and v 1 10[5])

The cases of retention of *s* before the cases of *pati* are so numerous, that it would be highly convenient to be able to dispose of them at once by quoting in the rule the theme *pati*, but such a proceeding is permitted (by i 22) only with themes ending in *a* I add the other combinations of this class which I have noted from the Sanhitâ *manasas pati* (i 1 13[3], 4 44[3]), *pathas pati* (i 1 14[2]), *brahmanas pati* (i 5 6[4] ii.1 5[7]), *jyotishas pati* (i 5 11[1] iv 4 4[6]), *çavasas pati* (ii 2 12[7]), *jagatas pati* (ii 4 5[1]), *sadasas pati* (ii 6 8[2] iii 2 4[4]), *çatinas pati* (ii 6 11[1] iv 4 4[1]), *nabhasas pati* (iii 3 8[3,6]), and *yas patih* (iv 7 14[3]) We have the genitive *pateh* in *brhaspateh* (i.7 8[4]), but, as the *pada*-text reads *brhah-pateh*, the word does not fall under this rule *tapaspati* (i 2 10[2], p *tapah-patih*)

---

27 ------ *evamparo visarjanîyo yathâvihitam*[1] *bhajate yathâ*[2] *brah-*---- *va iti kim reto-*---- *çubh-*---- *vâst-*---- *pra*---- *vâc-*---- *vâc-*---- *vâc-*---- *pad ity etâvatâi 'va siddhe* [3]*pratipadapâthena kim*[3] *divam*---- *ityâdinishedhârthâh*[4]

[1] B G M *-vidhim* [2] G M O om [3] G M *-thah kimarthah*, O *-tho* [4] O *-âdâu n*

belongs in the same category Of the words quoted by the commentator, *bhuvas pati* occurs again at i 7 10², and *vâcas pati* at ii 6 8¹·²

दिवःसहसस्परिपुत्परः ॥ २८ ॥

28 Also in *divah* and *sahasah*, before *pari* and *put*

The cited examples are *divas pari prathamam* (i 3 14⁵ and iv 2 2¹), *divas putrâya sûryâya* (i 2 9 O omits the last word), and *sahasas putro adbhutah* (iv 1 9²) We have *sahasas putram* also at iv 4 4³, and *divas pari* at iii 3 3³ and iv 2 10⁴, one case of *divah pari* is excepted by rule 34, below As counter-examples, are given *divah prthivyâh pary antarikshât* (iii 1 10² et al W B O omit *divah*, which is better, as this is used just below to illustrate another point), *parushahparushah pari* (iv 2 9²), and *puñsah putrâñ uta viçvâyushañ rayim* (iv 6 9⁴ G M O have only the first two words), to show that only the words specified show *s* before *pari* and *put*, and *divah prthivyâh pari* (iii 1 10² et al G M omit *pari*, which is better this time), to show that those words show it only in the circumstances stated

Put is declared a part of a word, involving more than one case

रायस्पोपरः ॥ २९ ॥

29 Also in *râyah*, before *po*

The commentator's examples are *paçavo vâi râyas poshah* (v 4 6²), *sam ahañ râyas poshena* (i 7 9²), *çamtanutvâya râyas poshâya* (iii 2 5¹ G M omit the first word and add *brhate*, which makes the reference belong to iv 1 10²), and *râyas poshasya daditârah syâma* (iii 2 3¹ only O has the last word) As counter-examples, he gives *vibhuh posha uta tmanâ* (iii 1 11²), to show that the rule applies to no other word than *râyah* before *po*, and *eshtâ râyah pre 'she bhagâya* (i 2 11¹ G M omit the first word),

---

28 *divah sahasah ity ayor*[1] *visarjaniyah pariputparo*[2] *yathâvidhim*[3] *bhajate divas---- divas pu---- sah---- anayor iti kim divah---- par---- puñ---- evampara iti kim divah---- anekârthatvât*[4] *pud iti padâikadeçah*

[1] B *anayoh*, G M *etayoh* [2] G M *pari put ity evamparo*, O do except *ity* [3] G M O *-vihitam* [4] B G M O *rthah*

29 *râya ity atra visarjaniyah po ity evamparo yathâvihitam*[1] *bhajate yathâ*[2] *paçavo---- po iti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah sam---- çam---- râyas---- râya iti kim: vibhuh---- *[3]*po ity okârena kim*[3] [4]*eshtâ----*

[1] G M *-vidhim* [2] G M O om [(3)] G M *okârah kimarthah* [4] B om to *yathâ* in comment to next rule

to show that only *po*, not *p* when otherwise followed, calls out the prescribed effect in *râyah*

I have not attempted to note the numerous instances of the occurrence of *râyas posha* in the Sanhitâ In the derivative *râyas-poshavani* (i 2 12³, 3 1²), where the division is before *vani*, the *pada*-text, according to its custom, leaves the *s* of *râyas* unchanged (reading *râyasposha-vani*)

नमस्करोपरः ॥ ३० ॥

30 Also in *namah*, before *karo*

The examples illustrating the action of the rule are *samvatsarena namas karomi* (v 5 7³), and *ubhayîbhyo namas karoti* (ii 6 9³ O reads *karomi*), counter-examples, showing the uselessness of either specification of the rule without the other, are *namah kapardine ca* (iv 5 5¹,9¹ W omits *ca*, O omits the example), and *ekahâyanâd enah karoti* (vi 6 3¹)

Other instances of *namas karoti* are found at v 5 5¹,7² vi.3 8⁴, and of *-vatsarena namas karomi* at v 5 7³ twice, 7⁴ twice

The printed text has *çreyasas karat* and *vasyasas karat* (but, by a strange inconsistency, immediately after, *paçumatah karat*) at i 8 6², but, as these combinations are unauthorized by the Prâtiçâkhya, and not supported by my manuscript, I do not doubt that the readings are erroneous

वसुष्ककारपरः ॥ ३१ ॥

31 Also in *vasuh*, before *k*

The passage is *sa idhâno vasush kavih* (iv 4 4⁵), and I have found no other Counter-examples, of obvious application, are given *viprah çucih kavih* (i 3 14⁸, 5 5³), *mayi vasuh puro vasuh* (iii.2 10²), and *viçvâvasuh pary amushnât* (vi.1 6⁵,11⁵ B, which is quite defective just along here, omits the first word)

नाध्वरं विश्वतोऽन्तर्गातोविविष्णुःपरुःपुनः ॥ ३२ ॥

---

30 *nama ity atra*[1] *visarjanîyah karo ity evamparo yathâvihitam*[2] *bhajate yathâ*[3] *samv-.... ubhay-....* [4]*karo iti kim namah....*[4] [5]*nama iti kim ekah-....*[5]

[1] G M O om [2] G M *vidhim* [3] G M O om, B omits to here [(4)] O om [(5)] G M put before *ubhay-*, B puts after *ubhay-....*, and om *karo iti*

31 [1]*vasur ity atra visarjanîyah kakâraparo yathâvihitam*[2] *âpadyate*[3] *yathâ*[4,1] *sa.... vasur iti kim viprah.... evampara iti kim · mayi.... viçvâ-....*

[(1)] B om. [2] G M *vidhim* [3] G M O *bhajate* [4] G M O om

32 Not in *adhvaram viçvatah*, *antah*, *jâtah*, *viviçuh paruh*, and *punah*

These words constitute exceptions under the foregoing rules The commentator specifies in each case under which rule the exception falls The first example is *yajñam adhvaram viçvatah paribhûr asi* (iv 1 11[1] O omits the first word, W B the last) an exception under viii 24, which would require *viçvatas*, W B O remark that the distinctive addition of *adhvaram* effects the exception, and W O add the counter-example *indram vo viçvatas pari* (i.6 12[1]) For *antah*, the example is *mahâdevam antahpârçvena* (i 4 36 O omits the first word) an exception under rule 23, *antah* being first member of a compound For *jâtah*, *bhûtasya jâtah patir eka âsît* (iv 2 8[2] O omits the first word, and alone adds *âsît*, G M omit *ekah* also) an exception under viii 27 For *viviçuh paruh*, *yâ âviviçuh paruhparuh* (iv 2 6[4]), with the counter-example *parushparur anughushyâ viçasta* (iv 6 9[3] only G M have the last word) For *punah*, finally, *punahpunar hy asmât* (vi 5 1[3 4] only G M have *asmât*). Both these last are exceptions under viii 23.

The versions of the comment to this rule are more than usually discordant, all being defective except W and O, and even these having suffered considerable disarrangement For the details, see the various readings below

धषवति ॥ ३३ ॥

33 Nor before a word containing *dh* or *sh*

"By vicinage," says the commentator, is understood a negative, in this and the next following rule The meaning of the rule is that, when a word containing either of the letters *dh* or *sh* follows the *visarjanîya*, the latter is not liable to conversion into *s* or *sh*, as required by the foregoing precepts The examples given are

---

32 ------ *eteshâm*[1] *visarjanîyo yathâvihitam*[2] *na bhajate*[3] *yathâ*[4] *yajñam----*· *âvirnir*[5] (viii 24) *iti prâptih* [6]*adhvaraviçeshanân nivrttih*[6] [7]*adhvaram iti kim indr-----*[7] *mahâ------* [8]*kakhapakâra* (viii 23) *iti prâptih bhût----- patnîvepatî*[9] (viii 27) *iti*[10] *prâptih*[8] [11]*yâ----*[11] *viviçur*[12] *iti kim* · *parush-----*· *punah----- kakhapakâraparah*[13] (viii 23) *ity anayoh prâptih*

[1] G M *ity eteshu* [2] G M *-vidhim* [3] G M O *âpadyate* [4] G M O om [5] G M add *idah* (6) G M om (7) B G M om, W O put next before *viviçur iti kim* (8) B om [9] O om *pati*, G M *patishpatim* [10] O *ity âdinâ* (11) W B O put after *mahâ ---* [12] G M *-çuh parur* [13] G M O om *parah*

33 *sâmnidhyâd atra* [1] *paratra ca* [2] *nañartho labhyate. dhaç*[3] *ca shaç*[4] *ca dhashâu tâv asmint sta iti dhashavat tasmin dhashavati*[5] *pade parabhûte sati* [6]*pûrvo visarjanîyo*[6] *yathâvihitam*[7]

bahihparidhi skandât (II.6 6[2] and VI 2 8[5] the same divisions contain each a second example of the compound), *purushahpurusho nidhanam* (VI.6 3[2] the same division contains a second example of the compound), and *ubhayatahkshnûr bhavati* (V 1 1[4]) I have noted besides only *parushahparushah pari* (IV 2 9[2]) That the word containing *dh* or *sh* must follow the *visarjanîya*, not be the one that itself ends in that letter, is shown by the counter-examples *adhaspadam krnute* (IV 7 13[3]), and *rtasya jyotishas patim* (I 5 11[1])

परिवाप्रपरः ॥ ३४ ॥

34 Not before *pari vâ* or *pra*

The examples are *rocanâ divah pari vâjeshu* (IV 2 11[1] only G M have the first word)—with the counter-example *divas pari prathamam* (I 3 14[5] and IV 2 2[1]), to show the need of citing *vâ* after *pari*—and *tasmâd itahpradânam devâh* (III 2 9[7] O omits *devâh*) Of these, the first is an exception under VIII 28, the other, under VIII 23 There is yet another passage, *bahihprâno vâi manushyah* (VI 1 1[4]), which needs to be brought under the rule, and the commentator accordingly declares that the quotation of *pra* in this rule with short *a* is intended to connote *prâ* also—just as, in a rule of the next chapter (IX 24), *athâ* connotes *atha* also, by a converse principle This, however, suggests a difficulty why then is not rule VII.7, prescribing for *prâ* an effect which had already been

---

nâ "padyate yathâ[8] *bahih-.... puru-.... ubhay-.... kakhapakâra*[9] (VIII 23) *iti prâptih. parabhûta iti kim adhas-.... rtasya....*[10]

[1] G M ins *ca* [2] G M O ins *sûtre* [3] G M O *dhakâraç* [4] G M O *shakâraç* [5] B G M O om [(6)] O om, G M *purvav-* [7] G M *-vidhim* [8] B-G M O om [9] B *-rapara* [10] W adds *tasminn iti nidishte purvasya parivapravarah*

34 *pari vâ pra* [1] *evamparo visarjanîyo yathâvihitam*[2] *nâ "padyate rocanâ.... ve 'ti kim divas.... tasmâd....*, *pre 'ti hrasvagrahanam dîrghasyâ 'py upalakshanam* [3] *yatho 'dathâparaç ca* (IX 24) *iti dîrghagrahanam hrasvasyo 'palakshanârtham*[4] *tarhi prâpûrvaç ca* (VII 7) *iti sûtram vyartham praçabdasyâ*[5] *'nuvrttasyâi 'va dîrghopalakshakatvâd*[6]. *iti cet ucyate pratyakshagrhîtasyâi 'vo 'palakshakatvam*[7] *nâ 'nukrshtasye 'ti vijñeyam* [3]*tathâ hi vâhanauhyamânah* (VII.6) *ity atra*[3] *cakârena praçabdas tatrâ 'nukrshtah atra tu*[8] *parivâprapara*[9] *ity* [10] *upalakshakatvam*[11] *bhavati tathâ satî 'dam apy udâharanam bahih-....*

[1] G M ins *ity* [2] G M *-vidhim* [3] B ins [(3)] here, as well as below, in its place [4] G M O *nam*, B *hrasvop* [5] G M ins *eva* [6] G M *-kshanatvâd*, O *dirghagrahanasyop-* [7] G M *-tvât* [8] G M om [9] G M *vâ* [10] G M. ins *prapara iti pratyakshagrahitatvâd*, O ins *pratyakshagrhîtatvâd* [11] G M *-kshanam*

prescribed for *pra*, a superfluity? Because, is the reply, such connotation is only proper in the case of a word directly cited, not of one that is brought forward by implication merely and in rule vii 6 the *pra* was thus brought forward [from rule 4], in virtue of the *ca*, 'and,' contained in the rule whereas here the *pra* is expressly mentioned This seems a case of rather questionable interpretation

न निर्णि निः ॥३५॥

35 Not so with *nih*

That is, as the commentator explains it, the exception established by the preceding rule does not hold good in the case of *nih*, which is treated as prescribed in rule 24, even before *pra* The cases instanced in illustration of the rule are both of a doubtful character the one is a *jatâ*-reading, *prâñcâu nir nish prâñçâu prâñcâu nih* (vi 4 10[2]), the other an extract from the ending of the same *anuvâka* (vi 4 10), *âtmanâ parâ nish pra çukraçocishâ*, these words being those which end respectively the first four divisions of the *anuvâka* We shall find other quotations of the endings later, and their appearance is at least decisive of the recognition by the commentatator of the breaking up of the *anuvâkas* into divisions of fifty words each, whatever we may have to believe respecting its recognition by the Prâtiçâkhya We are not, however, to take for granted that even the commentator accepted the division as now made in our manuscripts, involving a suspension of continuity of the *samhitâ*-text after each fiftieth word there was probably at first a mere enumeration made, with an expression of its results at the end of the *anuvâka* The endings, as may be seen in the Calcutta edition, are carefully accented, and written according to the rules of combination as laid down by the Prâtiçâkhya The same rules are followed in the *jatâ*-text, and hence, as (by rule vii 2, above) *nih* converts the following initial *n* into *n* in *samhitâ*, so does it also in the repetitions of the *jatâ* (*nir nish*) As a yet farther consequence, it has the same effect in the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya, and I have therefore accepted the reading *na* instead of *na* in the repetition of the present rule, although it is supported only by T and W

---

35 *nir ity atra visarjanîyasya*[1] *praparatve*[2] *'pi shatvanishedho na bhavati shatvam eva bhavatî 'ty arthah prâñ- - - - âtm- - - - -*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane[3] *ashtamo 'dhyâyah*

[1] O *niyah* [2] O *prapare* [3] O ins *prathamapraçne*

CHAPTER IX

CONTENTS 1–6, treatment of final *h* before initial surd letters, 7–10, treatment of final *ah* and *âh*, 11–15, of final diphthongs before initial vowels, 16–17, of the particle *u*, 18–19, duplication of final *n* and *n*, 20–24, conversion of final *an*, *in*, *un*, to *an*, *inr*, *ûnr*

ऊष्मपरो ऽघोषपरे लुप्यते काण्डमायनस्य ॥ १ ॥

1 *Visarjanîya*, when followed by a spirant which has a surd letter after it, is dropped, according to Kândamâyana

The commentator, after a brief paraphrase of the rule, gives a couple of examples to illustrate its working namely, *catustanâm karoti* (v 1 6⁴, p *catuh-stanâm*), and *vâyava stho 'pâyava stha* (i 1 1) The mention of Kândamâyana is declared to be made on account of a difference of views others, namely, hold that *h* is dropped before a spirant that is followed by a sonant letter as well, as *adbhya svâhâ* (i.8 13³), *ye çuklâ syus tam* (ii 3 1³ W B omit *tam*), *yo hatamanâ svayampâpah* (ii 2 8³ O omits *yo*, G M omit *pâpah*), and *dânakâmâ me prajâ syuh* (ii 2 8³, 3 4¹ O omits the first word, G M, the first two) I am not sure that I understand the consideration further alleged, in view of which it is decided that "the rule is all right," it appears to be that, reference having thus been made to a discordance of views, those words will be hereafter specified in which there is omission made under any other prescription—but what this refers to, I am unable to see

Every MS that I have reads *'ghoshaparo* as second word in the rule but the comment so plainly implies the reading *-pare*, and the sense so obviously requires it, that I have ventured its adoption

Although the prescription here given is put upon the authority of an individual, it is pretty evidently to be regarded as definitely

---

1 *ûshmaparô visarjanîyah kândamâyanasya mate lupyate tasminn ûshmany aghoshavatpare*[1] *sati yathâ catu-.... vây-.... kândamâyanagrahanam*[2] *vikalpârtham anyeshâm mate ghoshavatpare 'py ûshmani visarjanîyo lupyate yathâ adbhya .... ye.... yo.... dâna-.... evam ca vikalpâçrayane*[3] *sati lakshanântaragatam*[4] *yeshu padeshu lupyate tâni padâni vakshyâma*[5] *iti vacanam saralam bhavati*

ûshmâ paro yasmâd [6]*asâu ûshmaparah*[6] *na ghoshavân aghoshah asâu*[7] *paro yasmât* [8]*sa tathoktah*[8] *tasminn aghoshapare*

[1] G M O om *vai* [2] G M *-yanasya gr-* [3] W *-çravane*, O *-çrayagrahane*, G M *-lpântare* [4] W O *-nâtara-* [5] G M O *prav* [(6)] G M *sa tatho 'ktah* [7] G M om [(8)] G M om

adopted and taught by the Prâtiçâkhya, and is usually (not without occasional exceptions) conformed to by the edition of the Sanhitâ, and by my manuscripts both of that and of the Prâtiçâkhya and its commentary I have, therefore, treated it as peremptory, and have everywhere governed by it the readings I have accepted The same omission is prescribed by the Rik and Vâjasaneyi Prâtiçâkhyas, but not by the Atharvan (see Ath Pr ii 40, note)

अघोषपरस्तस्य सस्थानमूष्माणम् ॥ २ ॥

2 Followed by a surd letter, it becomes the spirant of like position with that letter

The commentator's examples are *yaχ kâmayeta* (ii 1 2³ et al , O reads *-yate*), *agniç ca me* (iv 7 6¹ O omits this and the next example), *ulûkaç çaçah* (v 5 18), *agnis te tejah* (i 1 10³ and vii 5 17 O leaves out *te*), and *yaφ pâpmanâ grhîtah* (ii 1 3⁵,4⁶ W leaves off the first word, G M O omit the last)

The requirements of this rule are by no means complied with by the manuscripts, nor have I followed them in the present work. In the first place, no manuscript that I possess, or have ever seen, attempts to represent any such sounds as the *jihvâmûlîya* and *upadhmânîya* (see i 9), or χ and φ, for these, *visarjanîya* is universally substituted, as if the sect of Âgniveçya and Vâlmîki (see rule 4, below) had supplanted all its rivals, and, in the second place, the agreement to leave *visarjanîya* unchanged before a sibilant (according to the view of the authorities referred to below, in rule 5) is nearly as general In my MS of the Sanhitâ, I have noted about thirty cases of conversion to a sibilant, in place of unchanged retention, and they are nearly all in a single limited neighborhood (in iv 5), where a different scribe has developed his originality a little As is hinted above, in the introduction, however, G and M make with great regularity the assimilation of *h* to the following sibilant, O does it not infrequently, the others, almost never

I have put together, in the note to Ath Pr ii 40, a statement of the variously conflicting views respecting the treatment of *h* before the different classes of surd letters held by the different Prâtiçâkhyas, or referred to in their rules, and it is unnecessary to repeat it here The sole point upon which all authorities agree is the conversion into *ç* and *s* before palatal and dental mutes respectively—and this is also the only point left unquestioned by the rules which follow here in our treatise

न क्षपरः ॥ ३ ॥

---

2 *aghoshaparo visarjanîyas tasyâ 'ghoshasya sasthânam ûshmânam bhajate yaχ---- ¹agniç---- ulû-----¹ agnis---- yaφ----*

(1) O om

3 But not when followed by *ksh*

That is to say, *visarjanîya* remains unchanged before *ksh*, the preceding rule for its conversion to *jihvâmûlîya* being annulled There is nothing corresponding to the usage here prescribed in either of the other treatises The commentator quotes a number of examples *manah ksheme* (v 2 1[7]), *ubhayatahkshnûr bhavati* (v 1 1[4] W B omit *bhavati* the *visarjanîya* was exempted from conversion into *s* before the *k* by VIII 33), *ghanâghanah kshobhanah* (IV 6 4[1]), *pûrvo 'rshtuh kshîyate* (III 1 7[1]), and *dyâuh kshâmâ rerihat* (IV 2 1[2] O omits the last word)

कपवर्गपरश्चाग्निवेश्यवाल्मीकयोः ॥ ४ ॥

4 Nor, according to Âgniveçya and Vâlmîki, when followed by a guttural or a labial mute

The two authorities here specified (the commentator calls them "holders of a *çâkhâ*, teachers"), it appears, reject altogether the *jihvâmûlîya* and *upadhmânîya*, since they prescribe the retention of *visarjanîya* in the only situations where those problematical sounds are liable to arise The commentator quotes a couple of illustrative passages *yah kâmayeta* (II 1 2[3] et al), and *agnih paçur âsît* (v 7 26 O has dropped out what follows *agnih*) Then, to show that on other points these heterodox persons accept our rule 2, he cites *madhuç ca mâdhavaç ca* (I 4 14 and IV 4 11[1]), *manas tatvâya* (IV 1 1[1] but B substitutes *namas talpyâya*, IV 5 9[1]), *âçuç çiçânah* (IV 6 4[1]), *yas somam vamiti* (II 3 2[6])

ऊष्मपर एवैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 According to some authorities, not when followed by a spirant, and only then

I believe there can be no real doubt as to the meaning of this rule, although it is not very explicitly interpreted by the commen-

---

3 *kshaparo visarjanîyah pûrvavidhim na bhajate yathâ*[1] *man-.... ubhay-..... ghanâ-.... pûrv-.... dyâuh.... kshakârasyâ 'ghoshavattvât prâptih*

[1] G M O om

4 [1]*cakâro nishedham âkarshati âgniveçyavâlmîkyoh*[1] *çâkhinor âcâryayor*[2] *mate* [3]*kavargaparah pavargaparo vâ*[3] *pûrvavidhim* [4]*nâ* "*padyate*[4] *yah.... agnih* [5]*.... kakâraç ca pakâraç ca kapâu tayor vargâu*[5] *kapavargâu tâu parâu yasmât sa tathoktah evampara iti kim madhuç.... manas.... âçuç ....: yas....*

(1) G M om, O *caçabdo nañâkarshakah âgn-* [2] O om [3] O *kapavargaparo visarjaniyah* [4] O *na bhajate.* [5] O *kavargaç ca pavargaç ca*

tator, and although G M O omit the negative in the interpretation (I presume, by a copyist's blunder only) Some authorities, who do not, like Âgniveçya and Vâlmîki, refuse to accept the *jihvâmûlîya* and *upadhmânîya*, nevertheless deny the doctrine of rule 2 to this extent—that they prescribe the retention of *visarjanîya*, not its assimilation, before a sibilant Thus, they would write *âçuh çiçânah* (iv 6 4[1]) G M, as is their constant custom, write here *âçuç*, and so does O, as is its common, though far from invariable, usage but this means nothing, for we have no good reason to expect the manuscripts of the commentary to conform themselves in any such case to a reading which will truly illustrate the matter in hand, they simply make the *sandhi* in the manner usual with them for example, under rule 2, no MS attempts to indicate the χ and φ, and W B give the *h* instead of the sibilant before the sibilant

If we reject this interpretation, our sole alternative is, so far as I can see, to hold that some authorities would accept rule 2 only so far as it relates to *h* before a sibilant, but would retain *h* everywhere else, even reading *agnih te tejah*, *agnih ca me* This seems altogether inadmissible Yet we must acknowledge that it is to some extent favored by the commentator's selection of counter-examples, namely *manas tatvâya* (iv 1 1[1] but B substitutes again *namas talpyâya*, iv 5 9[1]), and *yah kâmayeta* (ii 1 2[3] et al) According to our preferred interpretation, there would be no particular reason for quoting the former of these, since the combination it illustrates has been made a question by no one according to the other, it would be required (in the form *manah tatvâya*), to show what these dissidents held should be done in such a case

न प्लाक्षिप्लाक्षायणयोः ॥ ६ ॥

6 Not according to Plâkshi and Plâkshâyana

The natural interpretation of this rule would seem to be, that Plâkshi and Plâkshâyana are not of the number of those who hold the objectionable doctrine of the last rule, or of the last two rules If, however, I rightly apprehend the commentator, he declares it

---

5 *ekeshâm âcâryânâm mata ûshmapara eva visarjanîyah pûrvavidhim na*[1] *bhajate yathâ*[2] *âçuh---- evakârena kim manas----* [3]*yaχ----*[3]

[1] G M O om [2] G M O om [(3)] G M om

6 *kapavargapara*[1] *ûshmaparaç ca visarjanîyah plâkshiplâkshâyanayoh çâkhinoh*[2] *pakshe na khalu pûrvavidhim bhajate yah---- yah---- âçuç---- evampara iti kim manas----* [3]*kapavargâdi sûtratrayam anishtam*[3]

[1] O *kavargaparah pavargaparaç ca* [2] G M om [(3)] G M prefix *evam*, and put the whole at the end of the comment on the preceding rule, they also omit rule 6

to mean "in the opinion of these two authorities, it does not—that is, *h* does not follow the prescription of rule 2 either before a guttural or palatal mute or before a spirant" This is equivalent to a ratification of rule 4, and a ratification or rejection of rule 5, according as we adopt the one or the other of the two interpretations proposed for the latter, and it is, in my view, quite unsuited to the connection The discordant explanations of some of the other views of designated authorities given in the rules of the treatise show us that the commentators had not in all cases, at least, any certain knowledge by tradition of the matters referred to, but simply interpreted as well as they were able the notices of their text-book—and we have the same right as they in this respect If the particular point here under discussion were of more practical consequence, I should be inclined to go into a fuller discussion of it, as the case stands, it has perhaps cost us already more words than it is worth

The commentator illustrates by repeating several of the quotations already given—namely *yah kâmayeta* (ii 1 2[3] et al), *yah pâpmanâ* (ii.1 3[5] et al), *âçuh çiçânah* (iv 6 4[1]) these as direct examples, as counter-example, according to W O, *manas tatvâya* (iv 1 1[1]), for which B once more substitutes *namas talpyâya* (iv 5 9[1]), while G M read *agniç ca me* (iv 7 6[1])—the readings of which, as regards the *visarjanîya*, each manuscript gives in its usual fashion (except that W has this time *âçuhç çiçânah*, by a blundering divergence in the wrong direction), so that we are deprived of any farther aid from that quarter to the understanding of the rule

Finally, rules 4–6 are declared not approved

ओकारमः सर्वो ऽकारपरः ॥ ७ ॥

7 *Ah*, the whole of it, when followed by *a*, becomes *o*

The commentator's cited examples are *preddho agne* (iv 6 5[4] and v 4 7[3]), *samiddho añjan* (v 1 11[1]), and *so 'bravît* (ii 1 2[1] et al) He then enters into a long exposition intended to prove the necessity of the specification *sarvah*, 'the whole of it,' in the rule Without it, we are told, the reading *samiddho añjan* (in the second example given) would not be established for, by i 56, alteration and omission concern only a single letter, hence, if *sarvah* were omitted, only the final *visarjanîya* would be converted to *o*, this, with the preceding *a*, would become *âu* by x 7, the *âu* would

---

7 *ahsarvo visarjanîya*[1] *otvam*[2] *bhajate 'kâraparah*[3] *ahsarva ity akârena sahe*[4] *'ty arthah pre-.... sam-.... so.... ahsarva iti kim samiddho añjann iti na sidhyet*[5] *kim tu varnasya vikâralopâv* (i 56) *iti visarjanîyamâtrasya syâd otvam tata okârâukâraparah* (x 7) *ity âukâre krta âukâra âvam* (ix 15) *ity âvâdeçah tathâ sati*[6] *samiddhâv añjann iti syât* [7]*yad vâ*[7] [8] *svaraparo yakâram* (ix 10) *iti yatvam* [9]

be converted into *âv* by ix 15, and the final reading would be *samiddhâv añjan* Or, again [supposing the present rule not to be given], the *visarjanîya* would become *y* by ix 10, the *y* would be dropped by x 19, the preceding *a* would be exempted from further combination by x 25, and the *samhitâ*-reading would turn out *samiddha añjan*

The Ath Pr (ii 53) avoids the same difficulty by prescribing the conversion of the *h* into *u*, which then combines with the preceding *a* into *o* The other treatises (Rik Pr ii 12, Vâj Pr iv 42) treat the combination in the same manner as our own What becomes of the following *a* is taught in the eleventh and twelfth chapters

घोषवत्परश्च ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also when followed by a sonant consonant

Only one example of this combination is cited, namely *mâ no mitro varunah* (iv 6 8[1] G M O omit the last word)

The commentator raises against this rule the objection that, as prescribing the same thing with the one preceding, it should not have been made a separate rule at all, and, in reply, he promises that the exposition of the meaning of *tu* in the next rule shall explain the reason of the proceeding

अवर्णपूर्वस्तु लुप्यते ॥ ९ ॥

9 But *visarjanîya*, when preceded by an *a*-vowel, is omitted

In these rules, from 7 to 10 inclusive, the *anuvrtti*, or continuance of implication, is intricate and irregular in an unusual degree, and even beyond the measure of what ought to be tolerated The implication of *visarjanîya* being made all the way from viii 5 to

---

bhavati tasminç ca lupyete tv avarnapûrvâu yavakârâv (x 19) *iti yakâre*[10] *lupte parç ca paraç ca* (x 25) *iti* [11] *kâryântarâprasiddheh*[12] *samiddha*[13] *añjann ity syât tan mâ bhûd ity*[14] [15]*evam arthah*[15] *ahsarva*[16] *ity uktam*

[1] G M om, and ins *apy* [2] G M *okâram* [3] G M put at the beginning [4] G M *sahito visarjaniya* [5] O *sidhyati* [6] B G M om [(7)] G M *kim ca*, O *kim tu* [8] G M O ins *atha* [9] G M O ins *vâ* [10] G M O om [11] O ins *sûtrena* [12] G M *prasakte*, O *prasaktih tathâ sati* [13] W *ddho*, B *ddhâu* [14] G M om [(15)] G M O om, B om. *evam* [16] B om *ah*

8 *cakâra*[1] *okâram ahsarvam câ 'nvâdiçati ah*[2] *sarvo ghoshavatpara*[3] *otvam bhajate yathâ*[4] *mâ----* *nanu vidhâu samâne prthakkaranam*[5] *anarthakam iti cet uttarasûtre tuçabdavyâkhyânena*[6] *sphutîkarishyata*[7] *iti parihârah*

[1] G M put next before *anvâdiçati* [2] O om [3] G M O *raç ca* [4] G M O om [5] G M *-ksûtrak* [6] G M *khyane* [7] W O *-shya*

ix 10 (as pointed out in the comment to viii 5), rule 7 of this chapter ought to teach that "*visarjanîya*, when preceded by *a*, becomes *o* along with the latter, when *a* follows" instead of which a new subject, "the whole syllable *ah*," is introduced there, and *visarjanîya*, being thus replaced by something else in rules 7 and 8, ought to drop out of view altogether, or, if needed further, to be distinctly specified over again But we find it implied without specification in the present rule, and, farther, the being followed by a sonant consonant is brought down "by vicinage" from rule 8, while the *tu*, 'but,' the commentator says, merely annuls the being followed by *a*, as specified in rule 7 This is little less than absurd if the sequence of *a* was to be annulled at all, it should have been so in rule 8—or, rather, it was annulled by rule 8, and needs to be made no further account of The *tu* is here, as often elsewhere, a simple sign of a change of subject, and the commentator's attempt to give it a precise significance is—also, as often elsewhere—a failure Our rule means, by its terms, that *ah*, *âh*, and *â3h* lose their *h* before a sonant consonant, only, as *ah* was already specially provided for by rule 8, it virtually applies only to *âh* and *â3h* The statement is thus made more general than is needed for the case in hand, because the whole implication of "preceded by an *a*-vowel" is needed for rule 10, which is to teach that *ah*, *âh*, and *â3h* before a vowel—here, again, with the exception of *ah* before *a*, already provided for—convert their *h* into *y*, preliminary to dropping it altogether, by x 19 But rule 10 presents a more anomalous combination of two heterogeneous mattters into one precept than is easily to be paralleled elsewhere in the Prâtiçâkhya It is really made up of two independent parts one, *atha svaraparah*, 'Now then, when followed by a vowel,' which is an introductory heading having force through this chapter and the next, the other, *visarjanîyo yakâram*, '*h* becomes *y*,' and their combination is made in order that the implication of *visarjanîya* and also of *avarnapûrva* may be made from what precedes, and may not require to be distinctly stated.

The commentator's examples of the application of the rule are *devâ gâtuvidah* (i 1 13[3], 4 44[3] vi 6 2[3]), and *vicityah somâ3 na vicityâ3 iti* (vi 1 9[1], *somâ3* for *somâ3h*, by protraction from *somah* G M omit the last two words, O the last three) He adds, as his exposition of the connection of the rule, that the express spe-

---

9 *avarnapûrvo ghoshavatparas tu*[1] *visarjanîyo lupyate hrasvapûrvasyâu 'kâra*[2] *eva dîrghapûrvasya*[3] *plutapûrvasya ca lopah yathâ. devâ---- viç---- okâram ah sarvo 'kâraparah* (ix 7) *ity akâraparatvam pratyaksham tuçabdena nivartyâ 'numânikam ghoshavatparatvam parigrhyate sâmnidhyât asyâ 'nuvartanam evâ 'bhîshtam atre 'ti pûrvasûtradvayasya*[4] *prthakkaranam*

[1] W ins *sak* [2] B G M *vikara* [3] B *rva*, O *-gha* [4] G M *trasya*

cification of sequence by *a*, made in rule 7, is annulled by the word *tu*, and that an inferential sequence by a sonant consonant is assumed by vicinage [from rule 8], and that the implication here of the latter only is the reason why rules 7 and 8 are given independently of one another That is to say, such is the easiest way of arriving at the result desired, that the *h* of *âh* and *âsh* is not directly dropped before *a*, but passes through the intermediate step of conversion into *y*, as before the other vowels

अथ स्वरपरो यकारम् ॥ १० ॥

10 When followed by a vowel, it becomes *y*

That is to say, *visarjanîya* does so, if preceded by an *a*-vowel (rule 9)—except in the case of *ah* followed by *a* (rule 7) And, as is intimated by the prefixion of *atha*, the specification "followed by a vowel" is of force also in the following rules (through chapter x) I have remarked in the preceding note upon the anomalousness of this rule, as striving to fuse into one the winding-up of one subject and the introduction of another It has not seemed possible to render the *atha* excepting by a longer and more tedious paraphrase than I was willing to introduce, accordingly, I have left it out in translating the precept

The commentator's examples are *âpa undantu jîvase* (i 2 1[1] G M O omit *jîvase*), *tâ abruvan* (ii 3 5[2], 5 1[5]), and *anvârabhyâ3 iti* (vi 3 8[1], *anvârabhyâ3* for *anvârabhyâsh*, by protraction from *anvârabhyah*), and he gives further, as counter-examples, *âpo varunasya* (v 5 4[1] a not unexceptionably selected example, since *âpah* even before a vowel might not follow the present rule), and *agnir ekâksharena* (i 7 11[1] a case under viii 6, as the preceding under ix 8)

This conversion of *visarjanîya* into *y* is only the preliminary step to its complete loss, by rule x 19 The same course of conversion is followed by the Atharvan and Vâjasaneyi Prâtiçâkhyas (Ath Pr ii 41, Vaj Pr iv 36), but not by that of the Rik (ii 9,10)

एकारो ऽयम् ॥ ११ ॥

11 *E*, before a vowel, becomes *ay*

---

10 [1]*athaçabdo 'dhikârârthah*[1] *svarah paro yasmâd asâu*[2] *svaraparah iti uttaram yad ucyate*[3] *svarapara ity evam tatra nimittatvenâ 'dhikrtam veditavyam*[4] *sâmnidhyâd avarnapûrva*[5] *iti labhyate · svaraparo visarjanîyo 'varnapûrvo*[6] *yakâram*[7] *âpadyate yathâ*[8] *âpa---- tâ---- anvâ----. svarapara iti kim âpo---- avarnapûrva iti kim agnir----*

(1) G M *athe 'ty ayam adhikarah*, O *karah* [2] O *so 'yam* [3] G M *vakshyâmah* [4] G M O *jñâtavyam* [5] O om *purva* [6] G M put before *svaraparo* [7] O *yatvam* [8] O om

Of which, then, the *y* is lost by x 19, leaving only *a*, and this, by x 25, is not liable to further combination The commentator's examples are *ima evâ 'smâi* (ii 4 10[3]), and *ta enam bhishajyanti* (ii 3 11[4])

ओकारो ऽवम् ॥ १२ ॥

12 *O* becomes *av*

The example is *vishnav e 'hî 'dam* (ii 4 12[3]) For the further treatment of the *v* thus produced, see x 19 and the following rules

नाकारपरौ ॥ १३ ॥

13 But not, in either case, when followed by *a*

The dual number of the attribute in this rule, we are told, sufficiently shows that the two letters *e* and *o*, last mentioned, are its subject There are two different rules in the treatise applying to the case of a final *e* or *o* coming to stand before initial *a*—namely rule 11, above [or rule 12], and rule xi 1, which directs that the latter shall be elided—and, since the rules of this chapter are of paramount force, as preceding the other, the present precept is required in order to annul them

The commentator's examples are *mâ te asyâm* (i 6.12[5]), *samiddho añjan* (v 1 11[1]), and *te 'bruvan* (ii 5 1[3] et al)

ऐकार आयम् ॥ १४ ॥

14 *Âi* becomes *ây*

---

11 [1]*visrshto visarjanîyah*[1] *idam*[2] *idânîm ucyate svaraparah padânta*[3] *ekaro 'yam iti vikâram âpadyate ima---- ta-- -*

(1) G M *visargo nivrttah*, O *visargo vinirgatah* [2] G M om [3] W *-tah*, B *-te*

12 *svaraparah*[1] *padânta okâro 'vam iti*[2] *vikâram âpadyate yathâ*[3] *vish-----*

[1] G M *svarah* [2] B G M O om [3] W B G M om

13 *dvivacanasâmarthyagrhîtâv*[1] *ekârâukârâv akâraparâu*[2] *pûrvavidhim*[3] *na prâpnutah yathâ*[4] *mâ---- sam----- te ---- ity âdâv ekâro 'yam* (ix 11) [5] *lupyate tv akâra ekârâukârapûrvah* (xi 1) *iti* [6] *sûtradvayam prasaktam tatrâ 'pi pûrvatvât prabalam* [7] *yatvavidhim nisheddhum ayam ârambhah akârah paro yâbhyâm tâv akâraparâu*

[1] B G M O *-thyât gr-*, and G M O add *sannihitav* [2] G M O om [3] G M om *purva* [4] G M om [5] G M ins *iti ca*, O ins *iti* [6] G M O ins *ca* [7] O ins *ekârasya*

The example is *âsâmahâ eve 'mâu dvâdaçâu mâsâu* (vii 5 2[1] B omits the last word, G M O the last two)

To complete the *sandhi*, also, which is the subject of this rule and its successor, rule x 19 is needed

औकार आवम् ॥ १५ ॥

15 *Âv* becomes *âv*

The example is *ahâv anadatâ hate* (v 6 1[2])

उकारो ऽपृक्तः प्रकृत्या वकारो ऽन्तरे ॥ १६ ॥

16 An *u*, uncombined with a consonant, remains unchanged, and *v* is inserted between it and the following vowel

The definition of *aprkta* was given above, at i 54, and such a word was directed to be treated both as initial and as final (i 55) This rule makes an exception for the particle *u*, which becomes *uv* before a vowel—which, moreover, never occurs after an *a*-vowel except as combined with it, forming part of the class of *pragrahas* in *o* which were treated above, in rules iv 6,7 The examples given are *sa uv ekaviṅçavartaniḥ* (iv 3 3[2]), and *adanty uv evâ 'sya manushyâh* (ii 3 7[4]) I have noted further only iv 6 9[4], but am not sure that I have been careful to mark all the cases As counter-examples, *svapatyâya deva* (v 5 4[4], p *su-apatyâya*) shows that the *u* must be *aprkta*, and *bhakshe " 'hi* (iii 2 5[1]), that no other *aprkta* vowel than *u* is thus treated

न तत्तस्मात्साꣳहितः ॥ १७ ॥

17 But not in *saṅhitâ*-text, after *tat* and *tasmât*

The passages are *tad v âhur utsrjyam* (vii 5 7[1] O omits after *âhuh*), and *tasmâd v âçyam* (vi 1 11[6]) So far as I have observed, these are the only instances which the text affords of *u* following

---

14 *svaraparah padânta*[1] *âikâra âyam vikâram âpadyate yathâ*[2] *âsâm-* ...

[1] B G M *-nte* [2] G M O om

15 [2]*âukârah padântah*[1] *svarapara*[2] *âvam vikâram âpadyate yathâ*[3] *ahâv* ...

[1] B *-nte* (2) G M invert the order [3] G M O om

16 *aprktasamjñaka*[1] [2]*ukârah svaraparah*[2] *prakrtyâ 'vatishthate avikrto*[3] *bhavatî 'ty arthah ukârasvarayor antare* [4]*vakâraç câ "gamo*[4] *bhavati yathâ*[5] *sa*.... *adanty*.... *aprkta iti kim sva-*.... *ukâra iti kim bhak-*....

[1] G M *jña* (2) G M *ukarasvah* [3] G M *kâro* (4) O *vakarâg* [5] W B G M om

a consonant and preceding a vowel Compare the similar rules in the other treatises (Rik Pr II 28, Vâj Pr IV 87, Ath Pr III 36) The preceding precept being thus annulled with reference to these two cases, they fall under the general rule x 15, and the *u*, like any final, is converted into *v* To show the bearing of the specification *sâmhitah*, 'in combined text,' the commentator gives us the two passages in *pada* and *krama* form thus—*tat u âhuh tad u uv âhuh âhur utsrjyam* (but G M O give simply the first two *kramapada*'s), and *tasmât u âçyam tasmâd u uv âçyam* (here only W has the statement in *pada*) It thus appears that the combination with the preceding consonant is indispensable to the treatment of the *u* as here prescribed, failing that, it falls under the preceding rule, and becomes *uv*.

ह्रस्वपूर्वो ङकारो द्विवर्णम् ॥ १८ ॥

18 A *ṅ*, when preceded by a short vowel, is doubled

That is to say, when another vowel follows—the heading *atha svaraparah* (IX 10) still continuing in force The commentator adds also "when occurring at the end of a *pada*," as he has done in his paraphase of the preceding rules this is a matter of course, as we are dealing only with the conversion of *pada*-text into *samhitâ* His illustrative examples are *nyaṅṅ agnih* (v 5 3²), and *tam u tvâ dadhyaṅṅ rshih* (IV 1 3² and v 1 4⁴ only G M have the first two words) That the preceding vowel must be short, he shows by *parâṅ â vartate* (III 2 9⁷ and VI 3 8³), that a vowel must follow, by *sadrṅk samânâih syât* (II 2 8⁶ only O has the last word, only B G M have the inserted *k*, required by v 32, and G M convert it to *kh*, by XIV 12), and *pratyaṅk shadahah* (VII 4 2⁵ here all have the *k*, but only G M make it *kh*)

---

17 *tat tasmâd ity*[1] *etâbhyâm sâmhita ukâro 'prktah pûrvavidhim nâ ''pnoti*[2] *prakrtyâvasthânam vakâraç*[3] *ca na bhavatî 'ty arthah tad---- tasmâd---- ivarnokârâu yavakârâv* (x 15) *iti daçame*[4] *'sya*[5] *vidhir vakshyate*[6] *tat tasmât sâṅhita iti kim tat---- tasm-----*

[1] G M om [2] G M *''padyate*, O *prapn-* [3] G M O *-ragamaç* [4] O *-ma* [5] B *tasya* [6] O ins *tasya purastâdapavâdo 'yam*

18 [1]*svaraparo ṅakârah padântavartî hrasvapûrvo*[1] *dvivarnam* [2] *bhajate yathâ*[3] *nyaṅṅ---- tam---- hrasvapûrva iti kim par---- svarapara iti kim sad---- praty---- hrasvah pûrvo yasmâd asâu hrasvapûrvah dvayor varnayoh samâhâro dvivarnam*

(1) G M arrange *hr- sv- pad nak-* [2] G M O ins *dvitvam* [3] G M om

नकारश्च ॥ १९ ॥

19 As does also a *n*

The *a* in this rule brings down, we are told, the preceding cause of duplication and the duplication itself The cited examples are *nir avapann indrâya* (ii 4 2[2]), and *abruvann rdhnavat* (i 5 1[2]) The counter-examples, given for the same purposes as those under the preceding rule, are *niravapan yâny eva purastât* (ii 4 1[2] O omits the last two words), *omanvatî te 'smin* (ii 6 9[5] O omits the last word), *yân agnayo 'nvatapyanta* (iii 2 8[3] O omits the last word, G M omit the whole example), and *vidvân etam agnim cinute* (v 6 5[3]) The commentator does not give himself the trouble this time to inquire why two rules are furnished to prescribe a single process the reason is, evidently, because continued implication of *n* only is desired in the rules that follow

अनितिपरो ग्रहोख्ययाज्यापृष्ठ्यहिरण्यवर्णीयेष्वीकारोकारपूर्वो रेफमाकारपूर्वश्च यकारम् ॥ २० ॥

20 In *graha*, *ukhya*, *yâjyâ*, *prshthya*, and *hiranyavarnîya* passages, a *n* preceded by *î* or *û* becomes *r*, preceded by *â* becomes *y*, except before *iti*

The remainder of the chapter is occupied with rules respecting these conversions of a final *n* after *â*, *î*, and *û* before an initial vowel—conversions of which the original ground is the same with that which causes the combinations *n̆ç*, *n̆st* to result from the collision of *n* with *c* and *t* (vi 20, vi 14), namely the partial retention of an original *s* which followed the *n* as part of the declensional te *àçy* ...on of the word See note to Ath Pr ii 27 for a full stat... teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas respecting th... conversion of *n* to *y* is equivalent to its omission, since ... dropped by x 19 Rules xv 1–3 are also needed to c... combinations intended, by the nasalization of the pre...el, or the insertion of *anusvâra* after it

---

19 *cakârah pûrvanim..tam*[1] *dvitvam câ "nvâdiçati hrasvapûrvo nakâro dvivarnam*[2] *bhajate*[3] *svaraparah nir---- abr---- evampara iti kim nir---- oman---- evampûrva iti kim yân---- vid----*

[1] G M *purvoktan* [2] G M O *dvitvam* [3] G M *âpadyate*

20 *grahokhyâdishu*[1] *'vishayeshv îkârapûrva ûkârapûrvo vâ cakârâkrshto nakâro 'nitipara*[2] *itivyatiriktasvaraparo*[3] *repham âpadyate âkârapûrvaç ced yakâram graho nâma caturo 'nuvâ-*

As in other similar cases, the commentator, after his preliminary paraphrase of the rule, proceeds first to define the passages of the Sanhita designated by the titles it contains By *graha* is meant the fourth chapter of the first book, excepting its last four sections—or i 4 1–42 By *ukhya*, the first two chapters of the "Agni" book (see iii 9), excepting their final sections (which are *yâjyâ*)—or iv 1 1–10, 2 1–10 The *yâjyâs* have been already defined (iii.9, note), as the concluding sections of all the chapters to book fourth, chapter third, together with ii 6 11 By *prshthya* are intended nine sections, pointed out by the citation of the first words of each they are iv 4 12, 6 6–9, 7 15 v 1 11, 2 11, 2 12 *Hiranyavarnîya* designates only a single section, v 6 1 Examples are then given from each set of passages From *graha* passages, we have *jahi çatrûñr apa mrdho nudasva* (i 4 42), and *marutvâñ indra vrshabhah* (i 4 19 G M O omit the last word) there are four other cases, at i 4 20 twice, 21,41 From *ukhya* passages, *ye vâ vanaspatîñr anu* (iv 2 8^{3}), and *madhumâñ astu sûryah* (iv 2 9^{3}) there are ten others, at iv 1 3^{3} twice, $9^{2,3}$,$10^{2,4}$, 2 4^{2},5^{1}, 9^{5} twice From *yâjyâ* passages, *rtûñr rtupate yaje 'ha* (iv 3 13^{4} only O has the last two words), to which W B O add *amavâñ ibhena* (i 2 14^{1}), but for this G M substitute *madhumâñ indriyâvân* (iii 1 10^{2}), which is not in a *yâjyâ* passage at all, but falls under the next rule I have noted more than thirty other cases, namely at i 1 14^{4}, 2 14^{2}, 3 14^{8}, 4 46^{2}, 5 11^{2}, 6 12^{4}, 7 $13^{4,5}$ ii 1 11^{5} thrice, 2 $12^{3,8}$, 3 $14^{2,6}$, 6 11^{1} thrice ^{4} twice, $12^{1,3}$ iii 1 11^{1} thrice, ^{7}, 2 11^{3} twice, 4 11^{3}, 5 11^{2} iv 2 11^{3}, 3 $13^{2,3,4}$ twice The same passages contain five exceptions, which are duly provided for in rules 23 and 24, below From *prshthya* passages, the examples are *çatrûñr anapavyayantah* (iv 6 6^{3}) and *jaghanâñ upa jighnate* (iv 6 6^{5}) other cases at iv 6 7^{5},9^{4} twice, 7 15^{7} v 1 11^{4} Finally,

---

kân[4] *varjayitvâ "dade grâvâ*[5] (i 4 1^{1}) *iti praçnah agnikândasyâ "dyam praçnadvayam uttamânuvâkavarjam ukhyam* [6] *âkhyâyate uktâ yâjyâh samid diçâm* (iv 4 12^{1}) *jîmûtasya* (iv 6 6^{1}) *yad akrandah* (iv 6 7^{1}) *mâ no mitrah* (iv 6 8^{1}) *ye vâjinam* (iv 6 9^{1}) *agner manve* (iv 7 15^{1}) *samiddho añjan* (v 1 11^{1}) *gâyatrî* (v 2 11^{1}) *kas tvâ* (v 2 12^{1}) *ity anuvâkanavakam*[7] *prshthyam iti pathyate*[8] *hiranyavarnâh* (v 6 1^{1}) *ity anuvâko hiranyavarnîyah* [9]*grahe yathâ* [9] *jahi---- mar---- ukhye ye---- madh---- yâjyâsu rtûñr---- ama---- prshthye çatr---- jagh---- hiranyavarnîye agnîñr---- sarv---- anitipara iti kim abhy---- idâ---- grahâdishv iti kim trîn---- paçûn---- tân----*

itih paro yasmâd asâv itiparah ne 'tiparo 'nitiparah

[1] G M read *grh-* throughout [2] B om [3] G M O *ity etasmad anyasvar-*, B *iti 'ty etad asmâd anyas-* [4] G M O *'ntyanuv-* [5] G M *-vâ 'si* [6] G M O ins *ity* [7] G M *anuvâkâh* [8] W O *pachyate*, G M *pathyante* [9] G M om

from the *hiranyavarnîya* section, *agnîñr apsushadah* (v 6 1²), and *sarvâñ agnîn* (v 6 1²), which are the only cases Counter examples, of *n* not converted as here prescribed, because occurring outside the passages specified, are *trîn imân lokân iti* (vii 3 2¹), *paçûn evâ 'va rundhe* (v 1 1¹ et al), and *tân indro 'ntaryâmenâ 'ntar adhatta* (vi 4 6¹ G M O omit the last two words) And the bearing of the specification "except before *iti*" is illustrated by examples from the *krama* and *pada* texts, namely *abhyavartanta dasyûn dasyûn iti dasyûn* (i 6 12⁶, *dasyûn* is thus repeated, as being the closing word of the *anuvâka* but W O omit this repetition, which exhibits the very point requiring illustration, and B adds only *iti dasyûn* to the first *dasyûn*), and *idâvân iti 'dâ vân* (iii 1 11¹, *samhitâ*-reading, *idâvâñ eshah*)

Any general examination of the aspect of this mode of combination in the Tâittirîya text I defer to the end of the chapter

मर्त्यानुद्यानमृतान्दुर्यानसोमपूर्वःसोऽस्मानविमान्गोमान्मधुमान्हविष्मान्हूतमानार्षेचिकित्वानिडावान्कक्षीवान्बाणवान्हिपयस्वान्वशान्विदत्रानमित्रानरान्पोषान्महांश्च ॥ २१ ॥

21 Also in the words *martyân*, *ud ayân*, *amrtân*, *duryân* not preceded by *soma*, *so asmân*, *avimân*, *gomân*, *madhumân*, *havishmân*, *hûtamân* before any vowel belonging to the text, *cikitvân*, *idâvân*, *kakshîvân*, *bânavân*, *hi payasvân*, *vaçân*, *vidatrân*, *amitrân*, *arân*, *poshân*, and *mahân*

The *ca* in this rule, says the commentator, brings down from the preceding rule the specification "except before *iti*," but we might fairly claim that it involves all the specifications there made excepting the restriction to certain passages this exception the comment duly notes "this and the rules that follow have a general application, without regard to special portions of the text"

The illustrative examples are for *martyân*, *martyâñ âviveça* (v 7 9¹) For *ud ayân*, *ud ayâñ ajasram* (iv 6 3³) with a counter-example, *vayobhir evâ 'yân ava rundhe* (v 2 10⁷), to show that

---

21 ----[1] ---- *eteshu*[2] *grahaneshu nakâro 'nitiparo* [3]*yakâram âpadyate*[3] *anitiparatvâkarshako 'yam*[4] *cakârah vishayân*[5] *anâdrtya sarvârtho*[6] *'yam itah*[7] *param ârambhah yathâ mart*- ---- *ud ay*---- *ud iti kim vayo*---- *ud*---- *bhad*---- *na somapûrvah duryân ity atra nakârah somapûrvo yatvam*[8] *nâ ''padyate pra*---- *so*---- *so iti kim indro*---- *avi*--- *gom*---- *madh*---- *avigomadhv*[9] *iti kim paçu*---- *hav*--- *hûtamân ârshe*[10] *hûtamân ity atra nakâra* [11]*ârshe svare*

the *ut* before *ayân* needed to be quoted along with it For *amrtân*, *ud asthâm amrtân̐ anu* (i 2 8[1]) For *divyân*, *bhadrân divyân̐ abhy e 'hi mâm anuvratâ ny u* (i 6 3[1] G M O omit *mâm* etc) there are two other cases, at i 2 13[1] vi 2 9[1], and a single exception, *pra carâ soma divyân adityâh* (i 2 10[1]), quoted by the commentator in justification of the restriction "not preceded by *soma*" For *asmân*, *so asmân̐ adhipatîn karotu* (i 6 6[4] and iii 2 7[2]) another example is at v 7 9[1], and *asmân* becomes *asmân̐* also at i 6 12[4], but in virtue of the preceding rule The counter-example, showing the necessity of prefixing *so* in the rule, is *indro asmân asmin dvitîye* (iii 1 9[3] W B omit the last word) For *avimân*, *avimân̐ açvî* (i 6 6[4], 7 6[7] iii 1 11[1] but the last case falls under the preceding rule also) For *gomân*, *gomân̐ agne* (i 6 6[4], 7 6[7] iii 1 11[1]—that is to say, in the same phrase with *avimân*) For *madhumân*, *madhumân̐ indriyâvân* (iii 1 10[2]) Next follows a counter-example, intended to show why *mân* would not have been enough of itself to include the last three words, without the prefixed parts *avi*, *go*, and *madhu* it is *paçumân eva bhavati* (vi 2 6[2] et al.) Then, for *havishmân*, *havishmân̐ â vivâsati* (i 3 12) the word occurs a second time in the same section, and also at vi 4 2[4] For *hûtamân*, *devahûtamân̐ ity ukhâyâm juhoti* (v 5 3[1] W B omit the last word) it is found again, in like form, in the succeeding division of the section The specification "before any vowel belonging to the text (*ârshe*, 'coming from the *rshis*')," is declared to be meant as an annulment of the restriction, "except before *iti*," made in the preceding rule And, to show that the *n* remains unchanged before a vowel not forming part of the fundamental text, is given the *pada*-reading *devahûtamân iti deva-hûtamân* There is added further a remark which looks like a gloss that has worked its way into the text "the specification 'before what comes from the *rshis*' has force in both directions, after the fashion of the crow's eye [Molesworth says, the crow is regarded as having a single eye, which shifts from one eye-

---

pare[11] *yatvam âpadyate*[12] *dev-....* *ârsha iti kim* *dev-....* [13] *ârshagrahanasâmarthyâd itiparatve*[14] *'pi* [15] *yatvam bhavati* *ârsha iti kâkâkshivad*[16] *ubhayatra sambadhyate grahokhyâdimahânparyantam*[17] *ârshasvayampâtha*[18] *ity arthah* *cikit-....* *idâv-....* *kak-....* *viç-....* *idâkakshîbâne*[19] *'ti kim* *ras-....* *sam-....* *hî 'ti kim* *ûrj-....* *ârsha itiparatvâd dev-....* *itivad yatvaprâptir hi grahanena nishidhyate*[20] *stuto-....* *suvid-....* *amit-....* *arân̐-....* *posh-....* *agne-....*

[1] For *asomapurvah*, G M read *ity esha nakâras somapûrvo 'nusvaran na "padyate*, B O *na som*, as do T G M in the rule itself [2] G M O *eshu* [(3)] G M *yatvam bhajate* [4] G M om *ayam* [5] G M *vidhan.* [6] W *sarvo 'rtho* [7] W B *iti* [8] G M *dvitvan* [9] W O *avimadhv* [10] W adds *cikitvân* [(11)] G M O *ârshasvaraparo* [12] W *nayadyate*, B *bhavati*, G M O *bhajate* [13] G M ins *ity* [14] G M *pare* [15] G M ins *hutaman ity ukhayâm ity atra* [16] W O *kâksh*, G M *-kshinyayena* [17] W B om *mahan* [18] B *ârshah sv-*, G M *ârshabhâvân* [19] G M *idâdiviçeshena* [20] G M O *pratish-*

ball to the other, as it is needed]—namely, from the beginning of the preceding rule to the end of the present one" This appears to mean that an *iti* belonging to the sacred text itself would admit the conversion of the *n* before it, in any case falling under these two rules The opinion is doubtless a sound one, but, to prove its expression pertinent here, we require an example showing that there is a passage in the text requiring its application and none such is furnished us on the contrary, the addition of *ârshe* to *hûtamân* alone implies that none is to be found The example for *cikitvân* is *cikitvâñ anu manyatâm* (iii 1 4[1] O omits the last word) For *idâvân*, *idâvâñ eshah* (i 6 6[4], also at iii 1 11[1], but this is a case falling under the preceding rule) For *kakshîvân*, *kakshîvâñ âuçyah* (v 6 5[3]) For *bânavân*, *viçalyo bânavâñ uta* (iv 5 1[4] O omits the first word) Next we have again a counter-example, *rasavân eva bhavati* (ii.2 4[5]), showing that, of words ending in *vân*, only those preceded as here specified undergo the prescribed effect For *hi payasvân*, *sam asrkshmahi payasvâñ agna â 'gamam* (i 4 45[3],46[2] only O has *sam*, and G M O omit the last two words) the necessity of the prefixed *hi* is shown by the counter-example *ûrjasvân payasvân ity âha* (i 7 3[4]) Here, however, is a case of *payasvân* before an *iti* which comes from the *rshis*, and therefore might seem to require the reading *payasvâñ*, like *hûtamâñ* in the passage *devahûtamâñ ity ukhâyâm* (v 5 3[1])—according to the extension made above of the natural and obvious meaning of *ârshe*, but the commentator declares that the mention in the rule of *hi* as necessary preceding word prevents the conversion of *n* to *y* in the passage it is, to be sure, a case of *payasvân* before *iti*, but not of *hi payasvân* For *vaçân*, the example is *stuto yâsi vaçâñ anu* (i 8 5[1]) For *vidatrân*, W O give *suvidatrâñ apî 'ta* (i 8 5[2]), while G M have instead *suvidatrâñ avitsi* (ii 6 12[3]) B is defective here, dropping out the last part of this quotation, and the first part of the next (reading *suvidatrâñ apabâdhamânah*), G M are in the wrong this time, for the passage they quote falls under the preceding rule For *amitrân*, *amitrâñ apabâdhamânah* (iv 6 4[2]) an exception is provided for in the final rule of the chapter For *arân*, *arâñ ivâ 'gne nemih* (ii 5 9[3] O omits the last word) For *poshân*, *poshâñ apushyat* (vii 1 9) For *mahân*, *agne mahâñ asi* (ii 5 9[1]) another case at i 4 20

इन्द्रोमेऽकरूध्वमिहाप्येत्वगन्मेडेन्यानायजिष्ठश्चाचर्त्वकुर्व-
ताडुहददितिरग्रेऽधरान्त्सपत्नानलंपरश्च ॥२२॥

22 Also a *n* followed by *indro me*, *akah*, *ûdhvam*, *ihâ*, *apy etu*, *aganma*, *îdenyân*, *âyajishthah*, *â ca*, *rtu*, *akurvata*, *aduhat*, *aditih*, *agre*, *adharânt sapatnân*, and *alam*

---

22 ...... *ity evamparo nakâra*[1] *âkârapûrvo yatvam*[2] *âpadyate cakâra*[1] *âkârapûrvatvâkarshakah yathâ sap-.... ma iti kim. yush-.... nigr-.... yûy-.... agne.... dîrghena kim.*

The implication here, the commentator tells us, is of a *n* preceded by *â* only: he does not explain why, but would have a right to appeal to the mention of *ân* last in rule 20, and the exclusion of any other cases than those of a final *ân* in rule 21. His examples are as follows. For *indro me*, *sapatnâň indro me* (i.1.13^{1}, 6.4^{2}; iv.6.3^{4}), with a counter-example, *yushmân indro 'vrnîta* (i.1.5^{1}), to illustrate the need of specifying *me*. For *akah*, *nigrâbhenâ 'dharâň akah* (i.1.13^{1}, 6.4^{2}; iv.6.3^{4}: that is to say, in the same passage as the preceding: O. omits the first word). For *âdhvam*, *yûyam devâň âdhvam* (i.3.8^{2}: O. omits the first word). For *ihâ*, *agne devâň ihâ " vaha* (i.3.14^{8}, 5.5^{3}; iv.6.1^{3}), with a counter-example, *yajñiyân iha yân havâmahe* (i.5.10^{3}: only W. has the last word), to show that the *nimitta* in this case is *ihâ*, not *iha*. For *apy etu*, *gharmo devâň apy etu* (i.5.10^{4}: B. omits *gharmah* again at i.6.3^{2}), with the counter-example, *vidvân api janyeshu* (vi.1.6^{6}), to show that *api* without *etu* does not cause the conversion. For *aganma*, *suvar devâň aganma* (i.7.9^{2}). For *îdenyân*, *îdâmahâi devâň îdenyân* (ii.5.9^{6}). For *âyajishthah*, *devâň âyajishthah svasti* (iv.3.13^{1}, 6.1^{5}: O. omits the last word). For *â ca*, *devâň â ca vakshat* (iv.6.3^{4} twice, and v.4.6^{6} twice); but this example is omitted by G. M., and they also omit the item *â ca* in the rule itself. A counter-example, *yân â vaha uçatah* (i.4.44^{2}: G. M. omit the last word), is given by all but O.: in G. M., it should show that *â* causes *âň* only when followed by *yajishthah*; in W., only by *yajishthah* and *ca*; but W. states the occasion for it in the same manner as G. M., and B. alone sets it in its proper relation to both the foregoing examples. For *rtu*, the example is, in W. B., *vâjo devâň rtubhih* (iv.7.12^{2}), but G. M. O. give instead *yebhir devâň rtubhih* (i.1.14^{4}): I have found no other case. For *akurvata*, *vittvâ kâmâň akurvata* (i.5.9^{3}). For *aduhat*, *yajño 'surâň aduhat* (i.7.1^{1}). For *aditih*, *vivasvâň aditih* (i.5.3^{3}). For *agre*, *agnis tâň agre* (iii.1.4^{2}): we have also *vâyus tâň agre* in the same division. For *adharân*, *anyâň adharânt sapatnân* (iii.2.8^{5}), with a counter-example, *bhrâtrvyân adharân pâdayâmi* (iii.5.3^{1}). For *alam*, *purodâçâň alam kurv iti* (vi.3.1^{2}). Finally, to show that the rule applies only to *ân*, *paridhîn akurvata* (vi.2.$1^{5, 6}$).

The comment closes with an exposition which I must confess that I do not fully understand. It is evidently intended to determine the readings which the words treated in these rules shall have in *jatâ*-text, and it furnishes abundant illustrations, in reference to the form of which, however, there is not a little difference between the different recensions: G. M. O. generally citing the passage first

---

yajñ-.... ghar-.... etv iti kim: vidvân-... suvar-.... îdâ-.... devâň.... [3]devâň....[3] [4]yajishthaç ce 'ti kim: yân ....[4] vâjo.... yebhir-.... vit-.... yajño.... vivas-.... agnis.... anyâň.... sapatnân iti kim: bhrâ-.... puro-.... anvâdeçah kimarthah: pari-.... tattatpadagrahane kartavye parapadagrahanam [5]anârshe 'pi[5] samhitâvidhâv[6] agrahanasya[7] ca[8] ya-

in its *samhitâ* form, and adding only a single *sandhi* from the *jatâ*-text, while W B give the complete *jatâ*-readings, and only those The former quote first *amartyo martyâñ âviveça* (v 7 9[1]), and add *martyâñ amartyah*, W gives *amartyo martyân martyâñ amartyo 'martyo martyân*, and *martyâñ âviveça "viveça martyân martyâñ âviveça*, B only the latter (and, blunderingly, treats it as *amartyâñ âviveça*, throughout), next, G M O have *ud asthâm amrtâñ anu amrtâñ asthâm* (i 2 8[1]) W B, *amrtâñ anv anv amrtâñ amrtâñ anu* Then, in illustration of a second point, we receive two more examples G M O read *agne 'vimâñ açvî avimâñ agne* (i 6 6[4] et al), for which W B substitute *agne 'vimâñ avimâñ agne 'gne 'vimân*, and G M O, again, *ud ayâñ ayasram* (iv 6 3[3]), O this time adding the full *jatâ*-reading *ud ayâñ ayâñ ud ud ayân*, which G M also seem to mean to give (they actually have only *ayâñ ud ayân*), while W B set down the *jatâ*-form of the other pair of words *ayâñ ayasram ayasram ayâñ ayâñ ayasram* Yet once more, two examples for a third point close the tale in G M O *agnis tâñ agre tâñ agnih* (iii 1 4[2]), in W B *tâñ agre 'gre tâñs tâñ agre*, and, this time in all alike, *anyâñ adharân adharân anyâñ anyâñ adharân* (but G M have, doubtless by a copyist's blunder, *anyân* the second time, before *anyâñ*) It will be seen that the two versions are in part inconsistent with one another as regards the special points of combination to which they direct attention, and I am not able to make out what are the three classes of cases meant to be distinguished The three points which one would most naturally think of as needing to be noticed are, perhaps, first, the occurrence of a word like *amrtân* before itself—thus, *amrtâñ amrtân*—in the *jatâ* repetition, second, its occurrence before a preceding word (not its defined or natural *nimitta*) when that word begins with a vowel—thus, *amrtâñ asthâm*, and third, its occurrence in *jatâ* before the word which causes its alteration in *samhitâ*—thus, *amrtâñ anu*—if, indeed, this last can be regarded as requiring any special prescription Or, the second and third cases might be expected to concern the treatment respectively of a word, on the one hand, like *martyân*, which is itself quoted in the rule as suffering the prescribed change (which is at the same time *grahana* and *nâimittika*, or *nâimittikam grahanam*), and might therefore naturally be inferred to be liable to the change under all circumstances before a vowel, and one, on the other hand, like *anyân*, which is pointed

---

tvam syâd iti nâimittikasya ca nimittâpekshatvât grahanasya yathâ amartyo.... ud.... evam nâimittikagrahanasya · agne.... ud.... evam grahananâimittikasya[9] *agnis.... anyâñ.... evam sarvatra nakârasya yakârotpattir*[10] *drashtavyâ*

(1) B om [2] G M O *yakaram* (3) G M om (4) O om, W G M read *yajishtha iti kim* etc (5) G M *a* [6] O *-dhane*, B *dhanasye* [7] B om [8] G M O om [9] G M O *nasya nai-* [10] G M *nakâ-*

out by means of the quotation of the following word *adharân* (which is itself, therefore, *nâimittika*, while *adharân* is *grahana*, or which is *grahananâimittika*, 'undergoing a prescribed effect under the influence of a quoted word'), and which one might suppose changeable only before that word It is in accordance with this latter explanation that the last two pairs of examples are taken, the one from under rule 21, the other from under rule 22 At any rate, the general conclusion appears to be pretty well assured, that a word which shows a final *ñ* in *samhitâ* shows it also in *jatâ* before a following vowel of whatever kind This is markedly different from its treatment in *pada*, where, by the initial specification of rule 20, its power of conversion to *ñ* is lost altogether and even in *jatâ* (as was shown in the note to iii 1), an altered letter usually exhibits its *samhitâ* form only under the specific circumstances which condition that form in *samhitâ*-text

न रश्मीञ्छ्रपयान्यमान्पतङ्गान्त्समानानर्चान्यज्ञीयान् ॥२३॥

23 The *n* of *racmîn*, *crapayân*, *yamân*, *patañgân*, *samânân*, *arcân*, *yajîyân* remains unchanged.

All these are words occurring in the passages respecting which the comprehensive prescription of rule 20 was made needing, therefore, to be specifically exempted from its action The commentator quotes the phrases in which they occur, as follows *purutrâ ca raçmîn anu* (iv 1 2[3]), *aditih çrapayân iti* (iv 1 5[4]), *suyamân ûtaye* (iv 7 15[4,5]), *patañgân asamditah* (i 2 14[1]), *samanâ samânân uçann agne* (iv 3 13[3] only G M have the first word), *arcân indra grâvânah* (i.6 12[6] G M have dropped out all but *arcâ*), and *yajîyân upasthe mâtuh* (i 3 14[1] O omits the last word) The first two are from *ukhya* passages, the third from a *prshthya*, the rest from *yâjyâ*—as is noted also by the commentator (but G M omit these notices, save the first) Under the second, he further suggests the objection that, as the word following *çrapayân* is *iti*, the case might seem not to fall under the rule (since this expressly says "except before *iti*"), but he urges in reply that the word *ârshe* in rule 21 (that is to say, of course, according to his

---

23 [1]------ *eteshu*[1] *grahaneshu nakârah svaraparo 'pi na khalu repham yakâram*[2] *vâ bhajate yathâ*[3] *puru-.... adi-.... ukhyatvâd anayoh prâptih*[4] *nanv adi-.... asye*[5] *'tiparatvâd eva nishedhe sati grahanam anartham*[6] *iti cet ârsha itiparatvât*[7] *punah prâptih tan mâ bhûd iti brûmah suy-....* [8]*prshthyatvât prâptih* [8] *patañ-....* [9]*yâjyâtvât* [10] *prâptih* [9] *sama-.... arcân.... yajî-....* [11]*eshâm api sâi 'va prâptih* [11]

(1) G M *raçmin ity âdishu*, O *eshu* for *eteshu* [2] G M *vâ yatvam* [3] B *tatha*, the rest om [4] G M *ptinishedhah* [5] G M *atra* [6] G M O *thakam* [7] O om *iti* (8) G M om (9) G M om [10] O ins *asya* (11) G M om

"crow's eye" interpretation) gives the former precept authority over it, which requires to be annulled

उद्यापरश्चोद्यापरश्च ॥ २४ ॥

24 Nor a *n* followed by *ut* or *athâ*

The phrases to which this rule relates are, as quoted by the commentator, *amitrân un nayâmi* (iv 1 10³), and *vidvân athâ bhava* (iii 2 11² ³, our *samhitâ*-text has *atha*, because the word stands *vibhâge*, at the end of a division of the section see rule iii 10 and note) I have noted no other cases The commentator gives a counter-example to the former, showing why *ut* could not have been extended to *uta*, but needed to stop at the consonant (*hal*) it is *trîñr uta dyûn* (ii 1 11⁵) Such a counter-example is quite out of the usual course, and very superfluous, the example itself would be counter-example enough the substitution of *uta* for *ut* would have excluded the very passage aimed at Of the two phrases, the one comes from an *ukhya*-passage, the other from a *yâjyâ* the commentator might better have spent his spare energy in telling us this

What remains of the comment to this rule is not altogether free from difficulties First the statement is made that the word *athâ* in it implies also *atha*, with short *a*, in illustration, W repeats, without change, *vidvân athâ bhava*, B gives the same twice over, only O has, in *krama*-text, *vidvân atha athâ bhava*—which is doubtless correct, and shows the *krama*-reading (along, we may suppose, with the *jatâ*) to be the matter aimed at That the now accepted *samhitâ*-reading—*vidvân atha 2 bhava*—is contemplated, is not at all to be assumed Both the statement and its illustration are wanting in G M and this, although those manuscripts contain, under viii 34, the reference to it in advance there made In regard to what follows, also, the recensions are considerably at variance The *jatâ*-text is again under

---

24 *ut athâ*[1] *ity evamparo nakâro yathâvihitam* [2]*repham yakâram vâ*[2] *nâ "padyate* [3] *yathâ*[4] *amit-.... halmâtrena*[5] *kim trîñr.. .. vidv-....* [6]*dîrgho 'tra hrasvopalakshanam api yathâ vidv-....*[6] [7] *yathâsamhitâstham*[8] [9]*eva nimittam*[10] *svakâryam karoti*[9] [11]*nishedharûpam* [12] *yathâ amit-.... vidhir apy*[13] [14]*evam yathâsamhitâsthanimitta evam sarvatra bhavaty*[11] *ato*[15] *'vocâma*[14] [16] *so.... asm-.... evamâdi veditavyam.*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
navamo 'dhyâyah

(1) W B O *atha* (2) G M O put after *âpadyate*, G M *repham va yatvam vâ* 3 G M ins *cakaro nishedhâkarshah* 4 G M O om 5 G M O *ud iti* (6) G M om, B om *yathâ*, O om *api yathâ* 7 G M ins *ity atra*, O ins *atra* 8 G M O *-sthi* (9) G M *nimittair eva sambhavati*, O *nimittair eva sarvatra bhavati* 10 W B *-tte* (11) G M om 12 O ins *vidhirûpam vâ* 13 W, *iti* (14) O only *yathâ* 15 W *atho* 16 G M ins *yathâ*

treatment, and it appears to be laid down that any word has in that text the same form as under analogous circumstances in *samhitâ*, whether it fall under an exception or under a rule Then, as example of an exceptional word, is given, as established by the present precept, *amitrân ud ud amitrân amitrân ut* (iv 1 10³), *amitrân* retaining its *n* throughout, and again, as examples falling under the more general rule, *so asmân̐ asmânt sa so asmân asmân̐ avahâyâ 'vahâyâ 'smân̐ asmân̐ avahâya* (v 7 9¹ under rule 21)

So far, now, as I have been able to discover, the teachings of the Prâtiçâkhya in rules 20–24 of this chapter precisely correspond with the conditions of the known Taittirîya text I have not found in the latter a single case of final *ân̐*, *în̐r*, *ûn̐r* which they do not duly notice, nor an exception to the more general rules which is not provided for Of course, my observation is more to be trusted upon the former point than upon the latter

The *sandhi* here treated of is comparatively unusual in our Sanhitâ, as it is in those of the other Vedas According to my count, there are (including repetitions) 115 cases of *ân̐* (including also one at iv 6 6⁷, omitted above), 5 of *în̐r*, and 4 of *ûn̐r*—in all, 124, while, of final *ân* remaining unchanged before a vowel, I have noted down over 450 instances (and probably not without overlooking a score or two), of *ûn*, about 150, of *în*, 16, and of *r̂n*, 4—in all, about 620, or not less than five times as many The numerical relation in the Atharva-Veda is probably nearly the same See the end of the note to Ath Pr ii.27

CHAPTER X

CONTENTS 1–9, combination of final and initial similar vowels, and of final *a* or *â* with initial vowels and diphthongs, 10–12, resulting accentuation and nasalization, 13, special cases of uncombinable final *â*, 14, of elision of final *a*, *a* before initial *e* and *o*, 15–17, combination of final *i* and *u* vowels, and resulting accentuation, 18, special cases of uncombinable final *i*, 19–23, elision of final *y* and *v*, 24–25, uncombinable final vowels

अथैकमुभे ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the coalescence of two vowels into one.

An introductory heading to the whole chapter The commentator paraphrases "both syllables become one form, of the same kind"

---

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah ubhe akshare ekam rûpam sajâtîyam¹ âpadyete² ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah*

¹ O puts before *rupam* ² MSS *-yata*

दीर्घꣳ समानाक्षरे सवर्णपरे ॥ २ ॥

2 In the case of a simple vowel, followed by a similar vowel, the product is long

For the terms *samânâkshara* and *savarna*, see rules i 2,3, where they are defined The grammatical construction of the rule is not simple, or easily made homogeneous with that of its predecessor The commentator brings it out thus "there being a simple vowel, followed by one that is of like nature with itself, these two, being put in the relation of predecessor and successor, become a single long vowel" His examples are *tvacam grhnîshvâ 'ntaritañ rakshah* (i 1 8 only O has the first word, only G M the last), *râsnâ 'sî 'ndrânyâi* (i 1 2²), and *sûpasthâ devo vanaspatih* (i.2 2³ only G M have the last word)

अथावर्णपूर्वे ॥ ३ ॥

3 Now for cases in which an *a*-vowel stands first

A new sub-heading, having force as far as rule 9, inclusive The word *avarnapûrve* is explained by the commentator after the manner of a *karmadhâraya* compound, as meaning 'that which is both an *a*-vowel and first,' but I do not see how such a construction can be defended we have, rather, to understand *akshare*, and make the meaning analogous with that of rule 2 "when there is a syllable that has an *a*-vowel before it"

इवर्णपर एकारम् ॥ ४ ॥

4 When an *i*-vowel follows, the product is *e*.

The commentator explains *ivarnapare* in the same manner as *avarnapûrve* in rule 3 The interpretations might hold good, if *pûrva* and *para* were taken substantively, but they are not so used anywhere in the treatise His chosen example is *ne 'shtir bhava-*

---

2 *samânâkshara âtmanah savarnapare sati pûrvâparîbhûte*[1] [2] *ete ubhe*[3] *dîrgham ekam*[4] *âpnutah*[5] *yathâ*[6] *tvac-....* *râs-....* *sûp-....* *savarnam param yasmât tat*[7] *savarnaparam tasmin*[8]

[1] G M *pûrvah parah te.* [2] W O ins *saty* [3] G M ins *akshare* [4] W om, G M *adhikam* [5] B *âpnoti* [6] G M O om [7] W om, O *tatrat* [8] W B O om

3. [1]*athe 'ty ayam adhikârah* [1] *avarnapûrve*[2] *satî 'ty*[3] *etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah* [4]*idam adhikârântaram*[4] *upasargapûrva âram* (x.9) *iti paryantam. avarnaç câ 'sâu pûrvaç câ 'varnapûrvah tasmin*[5]

(1) O om. [2] O *-vatve.* [3] W om *ity* (4) G M *ayam adhikâra* [5] O adds *avarnapûrve*

ti (ii.5 5[3] W reads *neshtu*), and O alone adds *mahendrâya* (v 5 21, p *mahâ-indrâya*)

उवर्णपर ओकारम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 When an *u*-vowel follows, the product is *o*

The commentator's single illustrative example is *ishe tvo "rje tvâ* (i 1 1).

एकारैकारपर ऐकारम् ॥ ६ ॥

6 When *e* or *âi* follows, the product is *âi*.

The examples are *sam brahmanâ prcyasvâi 'katâya svâhâ* (i.1 8 O omits the last word), and *somâindrâ babhrulalâmâh* (v 6 15, p *soma-âindrâh*)

The commentator again very elaborately explains *ekârâikâra-pare* as a *karmadhâraya* compound, formed upon *ekârâikâra* as a *dvandva*; and remarks that the same explanation applies also in the following rule

ओकारौकारपर औकारम् ॥ ७ ॥

7 When *o* or *âu* follows, the product is *âu*

The examples are *brahmâudanam pacati* (not found in the Tâit-

---

4 *avarnapûrva ivarnapare ca sati* [1] *te*[2] *ubhe akshare ekâram âpnutah ne 'sh----- mah- ivarnaç câ 'sâu* [3]*paraç ce 'varna-parah*[3] *tasmin*

[1] G M. ins *ubhe akshare* [2] O om. [(3)] B *pûrvaç ca avarnapûrvah*

5 *avarnapûrva uvarnapare ca sati te*[1] *ubhe akshare*[2] *okâram âpnutah ishe-----*

[1] G M. O om [2] O om.

6. *avarnapûrva ekârâikârapare ca sati te*[1] *ubhe akshare*[2] *pûr-vâparîbhûte*[3] *âikâram âpnutah sam----- som----- ekâraç câi "kâraç câi 'kârâikârâu tayoh samâhâra ekârâikâram.* [4]*sam-âhâre dvandvah* [4] *tac ca tatparam câi 'kârâikâraparam karma-dhârayah tasminn ekârâikârapare*[5] *evam* [6]*uparitane 'pi sûtre*[6] *samâsah*

[1] G M om. [2] O om [3] G M *pûrvâpare*, and put before *akshare* [(4)] G M. om [5] O om. [(6)] O *-tanasûtre 'pi*.

7 *avarnapûrva okârâukârapare ca sati te*[1] *ubhe akshare*[2] *âukâ-ram âpnutah. brah-----*[·] *dâm-----* [3]

[1] G M. O om. [2] G M O om [3] G M. add *uktas samâsah*

tirîya Sanhitâ, although it is read at Tâittirîya Brâhmana i 1 9[3] we have *brahmâudanam pacet* at v 7 3[4], and *brahmâudanam apacat* at vi 5 6[1] O omits *pacati*, leaving the citation such as might have come from either passage), and *dâmnâ 'pâu "nibhan* (ii 4 13)

अरमृकारपरे ॥ ८ ॥

8 When *r* follows, the product is *ar*

The examples are *ardharca ekâm* (i 6 10[5]), and *âgneyya rcâ "gnîdhram* (iii 1 6[1], p *âgneyyâ rcâ*)

I have not noticed a single example in the Tâittirîya Sanhitâ of that retention of *r* unchanged after *a* and *â*, only with correption of the latter, which is the rule in the Rik and Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâs, and which appears also in the Atharva-Veda, though against the authority of its Prâtiçâkhya (see Ath Pr iii 46 note)

उपसर्गपूर्व आरम् ॥ ९ ॥

9 If a preposition precedes, the product is *âr*

The commentator points out that, as the implication "when an *a*-vowel stands first" is still in force from rule 3, this virtually means "if a preposition ending in *a* or *â* precedes," *r*, of course, is inferred from the preceding rule According to the list of prepositions given at i 15, then, *â*, *pra*, *ava*, and *upa* would be the only words authorized to form with initial *r* the *vrddhi* vowel instead of the *guna*, *parâ* and *apa* being excluded The commentator brings up but one example from the text, namely *upâ rchati* (i 5 9[6] G M read *upâ rchaty askandâya*, which I do not find anywhere we have *askandâya* after other words at i 5 8[5] ii 5 8[6] vi 3 8[1,3], the last time following *upâ 'syati*, possibly this text was in the mind of the scribe who added *askandâya* in the comment on the present rule), he gives another from the *jatâ*-text, *rtavyâ upo 'pâ rtavyâ rtavyâ upa* (v 3 1[1], 4 2[1]), and, further, as counter example, showing that only a preposition ending in *a* or *â* produces the prescribed effect, *vyrddham vâ etat* (v 1 2[1] et al O omits the last word) Additional cases of the same combination, with *â* and *ava*, are quoted under rule 10 (at the end), if the text affords yet others, I have failed to note them Nor have I observed any cases of the different treatment of *parâ* and *apa* before *r*, so that here also I do not discover any reason for the strange restriction of the class of prepositions made at i 15

---

8 *avarnapûrva rkârapare ca sati te[1] ubhe akshare[2] aram iti vikâram âpnutah ardh-.... âgn-....*

[1] O om [2] G M O om

9 *avarnapûrva ity anuvartate[1] tasmâd upasargapûrva ity aviçeshavarnântoktâv[2] avarnânto 'yam[3] upasargas tasyâi 'va grahanam rkârah sâmnidhyâl labhyate upasargapûrva rkârapare*

उदात्तमुदात्तवति ॥ १० ॥

10 When an acute enters into the combination, the result is acute

That is to say, as the commentator points out, when the first constituent, or the second constituent, or both constituents, have the *udâtta* accent, their combination is *udâtta* He gives a long list of examples in illustration of the working of the rule, promising that they shall exhibit the whole series of vowel-combinations just prescribed, from the second rule to the ninth, with all possible conditions of accentual combination Thus, *savitā́' prā́' 'rpayatu* (i 1 1, p *prá arp-* W reads *-yati*), *bráhma yachā́' 'pā́ 'gne* (i 1 7[1], p *yacha ápa*), *yấjyā́'i " 'vā́'i 'nam* (ii 3 5[3], p *yấjyấ ā́' evá enam* the *pada*-manuscripts have *ê 'ti* for *ā́'*, and so with the other prepositions), *pū́shā́' " 'dhatta* (i 5 1[2], p *pū́shā́' â adhatta* W B read *-tte*), *divī́' 'va cákshuh* (i 3 6[2] and iv 2 9[4], p *diví iva* for this accent, which is opposed to the teachings of all the other Prâtiçakhyas, see under rule 17 of the present chapter), *adyá vásu vasatī́' 'tī́' 'ndro hí devā́'nâm* (ii 5 3[7], p *vasati íti índrah* O reads at the end *'ndram eva*, which I do not find anywhere in the Sanhitâ), *mâitrâvarunī́' 'ty âha* (ii 6 7[4], p *-nī́' íti*) The question is then raised, whether the word *sū́'nnīyam* (vi 2 4[1]) does not fall under this rule, since it exhibits a coalescence into one syllable of two vowels, whereof one is acute, but the reply is made, that a special rule in a later part of the chapter (r 17) prescribes for it the circumflex The examples are continued *réto dadhâtū́' 't sakthyòh* (vii 4 19[1], p *dadhâtu út*), *vánaspátayó 'nū́' 't tishthanti tā́'n* (vii 4 8[3], p *ánu út* only G M have *tân*), and *tā́' dikshā́' 'pā́ 'dadhata* (v 5 5[4], p *dikshā́ úpa* G. M omit *tâ*) So many are examples of the combination of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel the rest illustrate the cases of coalescence in which *a* or *â* precedes They are *sê 'mā́'m no havyádâ-*

---

ca sati te[4] *ubhe akshare*[5] *âram iti vikâram âpnutah upâ-\.... rt-.... avarnântopasargaviçeshanena*[6] *kim vyr-.... upasargaç câ 'sâu pūrvaç co*[2]*pasargapūrvah tasminn*[7] *upasargapūrve*[8]

[1] G M O om *anu* [2] W *viçeshavar-*, B *viçeshoktâ yatha*, G M *aviçeshokto 'pi*, O *aviçeshaktav api* [3] O om *ayam* [4] G M om [5] B G M O om [6] G M O *upas*, G M B *-shena* [7] B om [8] G M om

10 *udâttadharmaviçishte varne pūrvatah parata ubhayato vâ sthite sati te ubhe apy ekâdeçam âpanne*[1] *udâttadharmakam*[2] *âpnutah udâtto 'syâ 'stī 'ty udâttavân tasminn udâttavati samânâksharam ârabhya sarvasmâd*[3] *ekībhâve* [4]*yathâkramam udâttânudâttasvaritapūrva ubhayor udâtte vo*[4] *'dâharanâni darçayishyâmah*[5] *sav-.... brah-.... yâj-.... pūsh-.... div-...., adya.... mâit-.... nanu sūnnīyam ity atro 'dâttenâi 'kâdeçe sati kim na syâd ayam vidhih udâttapūrvâdhikâre*

tim (iv 6 6[6], p *sáh imá'm* compare rule v 17), *tám ghê 'd agnír vrdhá'* (ii 6 11[3], p *gha ít* only G M have the last word), *savanamukhêsavanamukhe kâryê 'ti* (vii 5 5[1], p *kâryá' íti* B omits the first *savanamukhe*), *sé 'd u hótâ* (i 1 14[4], p *sáh ít* compare rule v 17 W B omit the last word) so many are examples under rule 4 Now follow those under rule 5 *prókshitam gopâyata* (vii 1 12, p *prá-ukshitam* G M omit this example), *á'rja sthó ''rjam vo bhakshîya* (i 5 6[1], p *stha á'rjam* O omits the last word), *svâyúshó 'd óshadhînâm* (i 2 8[1], p *su-âyúshâ út* G M omit this example also), and *imê evó 'pa dhatte* (v 2 7[3], 5 3[3], p *evá úpa*) The examples under rule 6 are *ná'i 'nam pratyóshati* (i 5 9[7], p *ná enam*), *êka evá yajetá'i 'kah* (vii 2 10[3], p *yajeta ékah*), *áthá'i 'kam utthá'nam* (vii 2 1[4], p *átha ékam*), *yán ná'i 'kám raçaná'm* (vi 6 4[3], p *ná ékâm*), *indriyám evá'i ''ndrêna* (vi 6 5[2], p *evá áindrêna*), *ví hí tád avá'iryatê 'ti* (vii 1 5[4], p *ava-á'iryata*), and finally, from the *jatâ*-text, *devêbhya á'indhá'i 'ndha devêbhyo devêbhya á'indha* (ii 5 9[1] but G M give only the *samhitâ*-reading, *devebhya áindha*) To illustrate rule 7, we have *kshatrásya cá'u 'jase juhomi* (iii 3 1[1 2], p *ca ójase* B O omit the last word), *svá'há'u 'shadhîbhyah* (i 8 13[3], p *svá'hâ ósh-*), *sá'u 'shadhîr ánu rudhyase* (iv 2 3[3], 11[3], p *sáh óshadhîh* another case under rule v 17 G M omit the last word), *prá'u ''kshîh kênâ 'pá íti* (ii 6 5[1], p *prá áukshîh* G M omit the last word), and *arunó ha smâ ''há'u ''paveçih* (vi 1 9[2], p *âha á'upa-veçih*) Under rule 8, again, fall *âgneyyá rcá' ''gnîdhiam* (iii 1 6[1], p *âgneyyá' rcá'*), *sá'i 'vá' 'syá rddhih* (vi 6 10[2], p *asya r'd-dhih*), *á'indhá rshishtutah* (ii 5 9[1], p *á'indha r'shi-stutah*), and *evá rshir asvadayat* (v 1 10[1], p *evá r'shih*) Under rule 9, finally, we have *á'rtim á' 'rchati* (i 5 2[5] et al, p *á' rchati*), and *avá'rchaty evám ávâram* (ii 6 3[4], p *ava-r'chati*)

अनुनासिके ऽनुनासिकम् ॥ ११ ॥

11 When a nasal, the result is nasal

The commentator quotes rule xv 6, which declares it to be the

---

saty [6]*ûbhâve ca* (x 17) *iti*[6] *sûtrena svaritasya viçeshavidhânâd*[7] *iti brûmah* *ieto---- van---- tâ---- evam samânâkshara-samhitâyâm ekîbhâvo*[8] *'nyatrâ*[9] *'pi drashtavyah*[10] *evam avarna-pûrvatve*[11] *'pi vakshyate*[12] *se---- tam---- sav---- se 'd---- pro---- ûrja---- svâ---- ime---- nâi---- eka---- athâi---- yan---- indr---- vi---- deve---- ksha---- svâ---- sâu---- prâu---- aru---- âgn---- sâi---- âindha---- eva---- ârt---- avâ---- evamâdi*[13]

[1] W *prâp* [2] B G M *-rmam* [3] O *sminn*, G M *upasargântam* [(4)] G M *udattânudattasvaritânâm pûrvatve ca paratve ca udattayor udâttatve ca yathâkramam* [5] O *prad-* [(6)] G M *ubhâv eva sati* [7] G M *vidhinâ* [8] W B *-ve* [9] G M *'trâ* [10] W *-vyâh* [11] G M *varn-* [12] G M *-ti* [13] G M *dayah*

opinion of some authorities that final simple vowels, not *pragrahas*, are nasal, and he states that the present precept has reference to them if such a nasal vowel, being acute, enters into a combination of the kind above described, the resulting single syllable is nasal. Examples, he says, are those already given. And he adds that the rule is not approved.

I cannot at all believe this to be the true interpretation. The rule seems, on the other hand, to belong to and represent the same view of the nature of a syllable ordinarily regarded as containing *anusvâra*, which appears so unequivocally at xv 1, and to mean that when such a syllable, being looked upon as one containing a nasal vowel, instead of a vowel with succeeding *anusvâra*, enters into combination with another vowel (of course, a preceding one), the result is also nasal. Thus, for example, *yah* with *añçum* would make *yo 'ñçum*, *svâhâ* and *añsâbhyâm* (vii 3 16¹ ²), *svâhâ 'ñsâbhyâm*.

स्वरितानुदात्तसंनिपाते स्वरितम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. When circumflex and grave are combined, the result is circumflex.

The examples of this accentual result of combination, as given by the commentator, are as follows: *kanyè 'va tunnâ'* (iii 1 11⁸, p *kanyâ` iva*), *chavî'ni chavyò 'pâ'krtâya svâ'hâ* (v 7 20, p *chavyâ` upa-â'krtâya*: G M O omit *svâhâ*), *yâjyâ'i 'shâ' vâ'i saptápadâ çákvarî* (ii 6 2⁶, p *yâjyâ` eshâ'*: G M O end with *'shâ'*), and *átha kvâ` 'syâ havanî'ya íti* (v 7 4², p *kvà asyâh*: O omits the last two words). He then goes on to point out that the word *svarita*, 'circumflex,' being used in the rule without any distinctive sign, we are to understand the "constant" (*nitya*) or "independent" circumflex (see rule xx 2) to be intended. For this alone arises at the time of production of letters and syllables, elements of words, but the other kinds of circumflex arise after the time of origin of words, in connection with the euphonic combination of

---

11. *apragrahâh samânâksharâṇy anunâsikâny*[1] *ekeshâm*[2] (xv 6) *ity ekeshâm*[3] *matam*. *tân uddiçyâ 'yam vidhih*: *tasminn*[4] *udâttavaty anunâsike pûrvatah parata ubhayato vâ sthite saty*[5] *ubhe*[6] *akshare anunâsikadharmam ekam âpnutah*. *uktâny evo 'dâharanâni*.

[7]*etad anishtam*[7]

[1] O om. [2] B G M O om. [3] G M O *yeshâm*, B *eshtâm*. [4] W *tasmâd*. [5] G M O ins *te*. [6] B O ins *apy*. (7) G M om., O *ne 'dam sûtram ishtam*.

12. *svaritânudâttayoh samnipâta ekâdeçe saty ubhâv api tâu svaritam âpadyete*[1]. *yathâ*[2]: *kan-* ---- . *chav-* ---- . *yâj-* ---- . *atha-* ---- . *iha svaritasyâ*[3] *'viçesheṇa*[4] *grahane nityasvarita eva*[5] *grhyate*. *tasya svaritasya*[6] *vyañjanânâm aksharânâm ca*[7] *padâ-*

syllables and words, by the requirement of such rules as xiv 29 and xii 9, and therefore primary quality belongs only to the "constant" circumflex whence, by the rule "when a general statement is made, that which is primary should be regarded as intended," it is proper that the constant circumflex should be here understood In such cases, then, as *áthâ 'bravît* (iii 2 11[3]), where the long *â* resulting from the combination of the final *a* of *átha*, which has the enclitic circumflex (by xiv 29), with the initial *a* of *abravît*, which is grave, has itself the enclitic circumflex, this is not in virtue of the present rule, but falls under the same general rule (xiv 29) that prescribes the enclitic circumflex

To this effect the commentator and, whatever we may think of the argument by which he attempts to prove that *svarita* in the rule means only *nitya svarita*, we shall not question the soundness of his conclusions

न धामापासिपरोबुध्नियाज्यापूषामिनन्तार्षे ॥ १३ ॥

13 Exceptions are *dhâ*, *mâ*, and *pâ*, when followed by *asi*, also *budhniyâ*, *jyâ*, *â pûshâ*, and *aminanta*—before a vowel belonging to the text

That is to say, these words constitute exceptions, not to the last rules respecting accentuation, but to those which prescribe the combination of a final *a* or *â* with the following initial vowel The commentator cites the passages in which the first three occur before *asi*, as follows *svadhâ asy urvî* (i 1 9[3]), *sahasrasya pramâ asi* (iv 4 11[3] O omits the first word), and *dhanvann iva prapâ asi* (ii 5 12[4] O omits the first two words) I have also noted, for *dhâ*, *varcodhâ asi* (i 2 1[1]), *dhâ asi svadhâ asi* (ii 6 4[4]), and *abhidhâ asi* (vii.1 11[1]), for *mâ*, *pratimâ asi*, *vimâ asi*, and *unmâ asi*, all in the same section and division (iv 4 11[3]) with *pramâ*, as quoted and, for *pâ*, *vratapâ asi* (i 1 14[4], 2 3[1] vi 1 4[6]) and *cakshushpâ asi* (i 2 1[2]) To explain the added specification "when followed by *asi*," the *pada*-readings are quoted for us, namely *svadhe*

---

vayavânâm utpattikâla eva sambhavât anyeshâm tu[8] *padotpattikâlâd*[9] *ûrdhvam aksharânâm padânâm ca*[10] *samhitâyâm udâttât paro 'nudâttah* (xiv 29) *iti vidhânât tasminn anudâtte pûrva* [11]*udâttah svaritam*[11] (xii 9) *ity âdi*[12] *ca tasmân nityasyâi 'va mukhyatvam sâmânyoktâu ca*[13] *satyâm mukhye sampratyaya iti tasyâi 'va svîkâro yuktah athâ.... ity âdâv ekâdeçasyo 'dâttânantarabhâvitvâd*[14] *udâttât paro 'nudâttah svaritam* (xiv 29) *ity anenâi 'va svaritatvam vijñeyam.*

[1] G M *ekam apnutah* [2] G M om [3] W O *-sya* [4] B *shana*, G M *shanam eva* [5] O om [6] B *-ta*, G M *sa*, O *sarva* [7] W om [8] G M *ca* [9] G M *paro-*, O *aparo-* [10] W om, G M O *vá* [(11)] G M *udâttam* [12] O om [13] W om [14] G M O *-nânt*

'ti sva-dhâ (only W has *sva-dhâ* in the repetition), *prame 'ti pra-mâ, prape 'ti prapâ* (O omits the readings of *pramâ* and *prapâ*) Further, to explain the final specification *ârshe*, 'before a vowel belonging to the text,' W gives next the *jatâ*-readings of *svadhâ asi* and *prapâ asi*, namely *svadhâ asy asi svadhâ svadhâ asi*, and *prapâ asy asi prapâ prapâ asi*, O has only the former, and substitutes for the latter *dhruvâ 'si dharunâ* (iv 2 9[1], 3 7[2]), which would be in place as a counter-example showing that other words than those specified in the rule are not treated as it prescribes before *asi*, but is not introduced as such, and does not make its appearance at all in the other versions, B also has only the former (reading at the end *svadhâ 'si*), and adds *evam âdi*, 'and so on' G M give no *jatâ*-readings at all here, but pass directly from the *pada*-readings to the quotations illustrating the remaining words of the rule, namely *pra budhniyâ irate* (iv 3 13[6] G M omit *pra*), *dhanvan jyâ iyam* (iv 6 6[1 2] only G M have the first word), *â pûshâ etv â vasu* (ii 4 5[1]), with a counter-example, *tam pûshâ 'dhatta* (i.5 1[2]), to show that *pûshâ* after any other word than *â* is not uncombinable, and *â te suparnâ aminanta evâih* (iii 1 11[5] G M. omit the first two words, O the first three) Now the question is asked again, "why is it said, 'when a vowel from the text follows?'" and W B O, having settled the point already so far as *dhâ*, *mâ*, and *pâ* were concerned, reply by quoting the *jatâ*-readings of the other four words, each with its successor, thus *budhniyâ îrat i îrate budhniyâ budhniyâ irate* (but B reads *budhniye "rate*, and O *budhnye "rate*, the last time), *jyâ iyam iyam jyâ jyâ iyam* (B O again have *jye 'yam* at the end), *pûshâ etv etu pûshâ pûshâ etu* (B O again *pûshâi 'tu* in the third repetition), and *aminanta evâir evâir aminantâ 'minanta evâih* (B O once more *aminantâi 'vâih* to close with) G M, however, who have the application of *ârshe* in the first part of the rule still to illustrate, give us here a most liberal series of extracts from the *jatâ*-text first, for *asi svadhâ* (i 1 9[3] or ii.6 4[4]), namely *asi svadhâ svadhâ asy asi svadhâ*, then for *svadhâ asi*, as set down above (with *svadhâ 'si* at the end, like B, but it seems a merely accidental coincidence, for in all the other cases the third pair of words reads like the first, with the hiatus), for *iva prapâ*, *iva prapâ prape 've 'va prapâ*, for *prapâ asi*, as above reported from W, for *pra budhniyâ*, for *budhniyâ îrate*, as in W, for *dhanvan jyâ*, for *jyâ iyam*, as in W, for *â pûshâ*, *â pûshâ pûshâ " " pûshâ*, for *pûshâ etu*, as in W, for *suparnâ aminanta*, *suparnâ aminantâ 'minanta suparnâs suparnâ aminanta*, and for *aminanta evâih*, as in W From all this illustration, we seem authorized to draw the inference that the words mentioned in the rule as having

13 *dhâ mâ pâ* [1] *eteshv*[2] *antyasvara ârshe*[3] *pâthe*[4] *'siparah budhniyâ jyâ â pûshâ aminanta eteshv*[5] *antyasvara ârshe*[6] *svaraparah pûrvavidhim na prâpnoti yathâ*[7] *sva-.... sah-....: dhan-.... asipara iti kim sva-....* [8]*pra-.... pra-*

endings exceptionally uncombinable in *samhitâ* nevertheless combine with *iti* in *pada* text, and also exhibit their uncombinable quality in *jatâ* only before the words whose sequence calls out that quality in *samhitâ*—*pûshâ*, for example, uniting with its predecessor *â* into *pûshâ*, and *amminanta* with itself into *amminantâ 'minanta* (only, if we may trust the example given, *svadhâ* being held apart from its predecessor *asi*, because this happens to be the same word with its successor and it is by no means impossible that the manuscripts are in the wrong upon this point) But this would be quite sufficiently intimated by the single restriction *ârshe*, without adding *asi* also, and that the latter is specifically intended to apply to the *pada*-readings, and the former to the *jatâ*, is not easily to be believed The *asi* would have best reason to be introduced because the words mentioned occur also before other vowels, with which they enter into combination—only, to be sure, I have not noted any cases in which they do so

इष्टेतनेमन्नोद्मन्नोष्ठेवःपरो लुप्यते ॥ १४ ॥

14 When followed by *eshtah*, *etana*, *eman*, *odman*, *oshtha*, or *evah*, an *a*-vowel is elided

That the elision mentioned in the rule is of an *a*-vowel is a consequence of the continued implication of the introductory rule x 3, above—although, as the commentator fails to point out, that implication was interrupted by rules 10–12, and was expressly stated at the outset to remain in force through rule 9 The passages contemplated are quoted by the commentator, as follows *açîy' eshtâ râyah* (i 2 11[1]), *çamitâra upetana* (iii 1 4[3],5[2]), *apâm tv" emant sâdayâmi* (iv 3 1), *apâm tv" odmant sâdayâmi* (iv 3 1 G M O omit *sâdayâmi* in both these citations), *svâh" oshthâbhyâm* (vii.3 16[1]), *upayâmam adharen' oshthena* (v 7 12 O omits the first word), and *nir amimat' evaç chandah* (v 3 5[4] O omits the last word) These are, so far as I have discovered, all the cases of application of the rule that the text contains The commentator notes that rule i 22, which allows a theme ending in *a*, quoted in a rule, to stand for its various derivative forms, is the warrant for regarding *oshthâbhyâm* and *oshthena* as involved in *oshtha* The

---

---- [8] [9]*ârsha iti kim, sva-* ---- [9] [10]*pra* ---- [10] *dhan-* ---- *â pu-* ---- [11]*âkârah kimarthah* [11] *tam* ---- *â te* ---- *ârshasvarapara*[12] *iti kim* [13]*budh-* ---- *jyâ* ---- *pû-* ---- *am-* ---- [13]

[1] O ins *ity* [2] B G M *eshv* [3] B G M *sha* [4] B *pâthakale* [5] B G M O *eshv* [6] G M *shapâthe* [7] B G M O om [(8)] O om [(9)] G M om [(10)] B *evam âdi*, O *dhru* ----, G M om [(11)] G M *âkârena kim* [12] O om *para* [(13)] See the note, above

14 ------ *ity evampara 'varno*[1] *lupyate athâ 'vârnapûrve* (x 3) *ity anuvartanâd*[2] *avarna*[3] *iti labhyate açî-* ---- *çami-* ---- *apâm* ---- *apâm* ---- *svâh-* ---- *oshthaçabdasya sarvâvastha-*

same two cases were given by him in illustration of the previous rule (see note to i 22) As general counter-examples, to prove the implication of "an *a*-vowel," we have *çityoshthah çitibhruh* (v 6 14), and *çityoshthâya svâhâ* (vii 3 17)

इवर्णोकारौ यवकारौ ॥ १५ ॥

15 An *i*-vowel and *u* become respectively *y* and *v*

Here, the commentator tells us, the implication "preceded by an *a*-vowel" ceases, but the implication "followed by a vowel" has force—which implication comes all the way from rule 10 of the preceding chapter The rule says *ukâra*, 'short *u*,' instead of *uvarna*, 'an *u*-vowel,' because long *û* has already (by iv 5) been declared *pragraha*, and protracted *û3* is made uncombinable below (by x 24) The examples are *abhy asthât* (iv 2 8[1]), *ûty açyâma* (i.3 14[3]), and *â pûshâ etv â vasu* (ii.4 5[1])

उदात्तयोश्च परो ऽनुदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ १६ ॥

16 And, when they are acute, a following grave becomes circumflex.

The word "and" (*ca*), we are told, brings down from the preceding rule the "*i*-vowel and *u*," there described as suffering a certain effect The examples given of the production of this kind of circumflex accent, later (xx 1) described as the *kshâipra*, are *vy èvâ'i 'nena pári dhatte* (v 3 11[3] only G M have the last two words), and *apsv àgne* (iv 2 11[3]) As counter-examples, we have first *nīcâ' tám dhakshy atasám* (i.2 14[2]) and *mádhv ugnâ'u juhóti* (ii.3 2[9]), to show that unless the converted vowels are acute, no circumflex appears, and then, to prove that the following vowel must also be grave, *tád yád rcy ádhy akshárâni* (ii 4 11[1] G M omit the first word), *sá tv 'â'i yajeta* (ii 6 6[3] et al G M omit this whole example), and *ín nv 'â' úpastîrnam ichánti* (i 6 7[3])

---

sya grahanam bhavati grahanasya ca (i.22) *iti vacanât upay-* ---- *nir*---- [4]*avarno lupyata*[4] *iti kim çity*---- *çity*----

[1] G M *-napurvo* [2] W *-tamanimad*, G M *-tamânah* [3] G M *avarnapurva* [(4)] B *-napurva l-*, O *nalopa*, G M *napurva*

15. *avarnapûrvâdhikâro nivrttah svaraparâdhikâras tu vartate atha svaraparo yakâram* (ix 10) *iti pûrvâdhyâye prakrântah ivarnokârâu padântâu*[1] *svaraparâu yathâsamkhyena*[2] *yavakârâv âpadyete abhy*---- *ûty*---- *â pû*---- *dîrghasya pragrahavidhânât plutasya samdhinishedhâd ukârasya kârottaratvam*[3] *krtam ivarnokârâu yavakârâv iti*

[1] W puts after the next word. [2] G M *-khyam* [3] G M *vakâr-*

compare, for the peculiar *sandhi* in these last two examples, rule v 13

ऊभावे च ॥ १७ ॥

17 Also when *û* is the product of the combination

The "also" (*ca*) of this rule is interpreted as implying that, as in the case of the combination last considered, the first element going to form the *û* must be acute, and the second grave As examples of the combination and its accentual result are given *sû'nnîyam iva* (vi 2 4[1], p *sú-unnîyam*), *sû'dgâtâ* (vii 1 8[1], p *sú-udgâtâ*), and *mâsû' 'ttishthan* (vii 5 2[2], p *mâsú ut-*), to which G M add *dikshû' 'padâdhâti* (v 5 5[4], p *dikshú upa-dâ*) The only other case of the kind which I have noted in the Sanhitâ is *sû'pasadanah* (vii.5 20, p *sú-upasadanah*) The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples the first, *sûpasthâ' devâh* (i 2 2[3], p *su-upasthâ'h*), shows that the former *u* must be acute, the other, *tâ' dikshû' 'pâ 'dadhata* (v 5 5[4]), that the latter *u* must be grave A later rule (xx 5) gives this particular variety of the circumflex accent the name *praçlishta*

None of the other Vedic texts has an accentual usage corresponding with this Indeed, there is not in the Atharvan a single case of a combination of two *u*'s such as is here contemplated, nor has any from the other Vedas come to my notice, if such there be, they are left to follow the general analogy of combinations of acute and grave into one homogeneous vowel (as illustrated under rule 10, above), the acute element raising the other to its own pitch and making the result acute On the other hand, an exception to this general analogy is made in the other Sanhitâs (and duly explained in their Prâtiçâkhyas see Rik Pr iii.7, Vâj Pr iv 132, Ath Pr iii 56), in favor of the coalescence of two short *i*'s into a long *î*, if the former be acute and the latter grave, they produce together a circumflex Of such a combination, I have

---

16 *cakârah pûrvasûtroktanimittinâv*[1] [2]*ivarnokârâv anvâdiçati udâttayor*[2] *ivarnokârayoh paro 'nudâttaç ca*[3] *svâritam âpadyate vy---- apsv---- udâttayor iti kim nîçâ---- madhv---- paro 'nudâtta iti kim tad---- sa----: in----*

[1] G M *-ttino 'pi* (2) G M om [3] O om

17 *cakârah pûrvodâttatvânvâkarshakah*[1] [2]*parasyâ 'nudâttatvam anvâdiçati ca*[2]. *pûrveno 'dâttena parasyâ 'nudâttasyo "bhâve kriyamâne*[3] *svaritam jânîyât yathâ sûn----- sûd----- mâ----* [4]*dik----*[4] *pûrveno 'dâttena kim sûp----. parasyâ 'nudâttasye 'ti kim tâ----.*

[1] B O *pûrvasyo 'd-*, O *-tvânuk-*, G M *pûrvodâttam paratvânudâttam câ "karshati* (2) G M om, O. om *ca* [3] G M om (4) W B O. om

noted about thirty cases in the Taittirîya text (examples, one in each book, are i 3 6² ii.1 3¹ iii.5 5² iv 1 6² v 1 7² vi.1 1⁶ vii 5 7⁴), the accentuation is throughout acute, as we should expect

न श्येती मिथुनी ॥ १८ ॥

18 Exceptions are *çyetî* and *mithunî*

That is to say, these words are exceptions to rule 15—and, being thus exempt from the conversion there prescribed, and there being no other rule requiring their alteration, they remain unchanged, as if they were *pragrahas* Their examples are *çyâitena çyetî akuruta* (v 5 8¹ O omits the first word, *çyetî* occurs also in the next division of the same section, though not before a vowel), and *na mithunî abhavan* (v 3 6² B omits *na*) The latter word is found in two other places—at iii.4 9¹ and vi 5 8⁶—exhibiting the same uncombinable quality, and in the latter place it has been made (at iv 53) the subject of special exception as not a *pragraha* The *pada*-text, in fact, writes both words as if no peculiar character belonged to them

लुप्येते त्ववर्णपूर्वौ यवकारौ ॥ १९ ॥

19 But *y* and *v* are elided, when preceded by an *a*-vowel.

The word "but" (*tu*) in this rule, the commentator says, annuls the application of the rule to any other *y* and *v* than such as are the products of prescribed euphonic processes, and makes these alone the subjects of its action As a *y* or *v* can never occur as final except by euphonic conversion, the particle has no very useful office to fill, according to the interpretation Evidently enough, it is used here, as elsewhere in the treatise where a specific force is sought for it by the comment, simply as indicative of a sudden change of subject

Vastly the largest class of cases falling under the rule is that in which, by ix 10, a *visarjanîya* has been converted into *y* after *a*, *â*, *â3* before another vowel than *a* In illustration of this class, the commentator quotes *âpa undantu* (i 2 1¹), *dhruvâ asmin gopatâu* (i 1 1 G M O omit the last word), and *na vicityâ3 iti* (vi 1 9¹) The next class consists of cases of final *e* and *âi*, converted into *ay* and *ây* by ix 11,14 the examples are *ima evâ 'smâi* (ii.4 10³), and *âsâmahâ eve 'mâu* (vii 5 2¹) Yet another class embraces the endings in *ân* of which the *n* was turned to *y* (with nasalization of the *â*, or with *anusvâra* added, by xv 1–3) according to the rules at the end of the last chapter (ix 20–24) the selected example is *martyâñ âviveça* (v 7 9¹) But the rule teaches also the

---

18 *çyetî mithunî ity etayor antyasvaro yathâvihitam*[1] *ya tvam nâ "padyate yathâ*[2] *çyâi- .... na ....*

[1] O om [2] W G M O om

elision of final *v*, and O boldly gives examples for this, as well namely, *vâyav ishtaye* (ii 2 12[8] W adds *durone*), and *ahâv anadata* (v 6 1[2]), although the text, by a usage which the comment ratifies under the next rule but one (x 21), retains the *v* in such cases, and it is retained by O in these very phrases given to illustrate its omission W has only the former of the two, foolishly prefixing to it *avarnapûrva iti kim*, 'why is it said, "when an *a*-vowel precedes?"' The other manuscripts pass the point without notice here, leaving it to be settled under rule 21 The true counter-examples for this precept, showing that the elision takes place only after an *a*-vowel, are given by all alike they are *abhy asthât* (iv 2 8[1]), and *hrtsvasah* (iv 2 11[3])

नोख्यस्य ॥ २० ॥

20 Not so, according to Ukhya

Ukhya denies that *y* and *v* are omitted in any case, and would therefore read *âpay undantu*, *imay eva*, *martyâñy â*, and so on

वकारस्तु सांकृत्यस्य ॥ २१ ॥

21 Not *v*, according to Sâmkrtya.

The connection of this rule is somewhat anomalous, but its meaning is sufficiently evident Sâmkrtya dissents from the principle laid down in rule 19, like Ukhya, "but" (*tu*) his dissent does not go the whole length of the latter's, according to him, only *v* is "not" elided As the commentator has it, the fact that this rule teaches an exception is inferred, "by vicinage," from its predecessor its *tu* is intended as an annulment of the opinion of former teachers And he declares that it alone is approved, while the two that precede (the former of them, of course, only so far as it is inconsistent with this) and the two that follow (B O omit this) are rejected The examples are those already given by a part of the MSS under rule 19, namely *vâyav ishtaye durone* (ii 2 12[8]

---

19 *avarnapûrvâu svaraparâu yakâravakârâu*[1] *lupyete yathâ âpa---- dhru---- na---- ima---- âsâ----* [2] *vây----* [3]*ahâv----* [3] *mart---- evampûrvâv*[4] *iti kim abhy ---- hrt---- tuçabda itarâu yavakârâu nivartayann âdeçapraptayor evâ 'nayor lopavishayatvam dyotayati avarnah pûrvo yâbhyâm tâv avarnapûrvâu*

[1] G M *yavak-* [2] W ins. *avarnapurva iti kim* [3] Only in O [4] G M *avarnap-*

20 *ukhyasya* [1] *çâkhinah pakshe*[2] *'varnapûrvâu*[3] *yavakârâu na*[4] *lupyete uktâny evo 'dâharanâni*

[1] G M ins *mate* [2] G M *mate* [3] O *'pûrvâu* [4] B om G M have mixed together to some extent this and the following comment

W B omit this example, O puts it after the other one, and leaves off *durone*), and *ahâv anadatâ hate* (v 6 1[2] O omits *hate*)

This is rather the most striking example afforded us of the over-riding by the commentary of the obvious intent of the Prâtiçâkhya itself The usage of the existing Taittirîya text is on the side of the comment we have a similar resolution of the final *a* of vocatives into *av*, with retention of the *v*, at i 2 13[2] twice, 4 39, 6 12[3] ii 2 12[4,8], 4 12[3], 6 11[1] iii 2 10 vi.4 3[3] Of *âv* as result of final *âu* before a vowel, I have failed to collect the examples, but had there been any cases of the omission of the *v*, I think I should not have omitted to observe and note them

उकारौकारपरौ लुप्येते माचाकीयस्य ॥ २२ ॥

22 According to Mâcâkîya, both are omitted when followed by *u* or *o*

Instead of Mâcâkîya, the southern manuscripts have, both in the rule and in the commentary, Mâyikâya

All the manuscripts of the commentary declare that "respectively" (*yathâsamkhyam*) is to be understood in the rule—that is to say, that it directs us to drop *y* before *u*, and *v* before *o*, but their examples do not support this interpretation, and it is palpably a false one It is difficult to believe that the rule itself is not corrupted, and that it ought not to read *ukârâukârapaio lupyate*, '*v* is dropped before *u* or *o*' (it does not occur in the text before *û*), for, while we can discover no phonetic reason for the omission of *y* before a labial vowel, there is a very obvious difficulty in the utterance of *v* (*w*) before *u* (no real Sanskrit word begins with *vu*, nor can I recall it in the interior of a word except as the rare result of *sandhi*), and, as thus amended, Mâcâkîya's view would accord with the accepted doctrine of the Rik Prât (ii 9–11), and with one mentioned, though not adopted, by the Vâj Pr (iv 125)

The illustrative examples given are in part those which have appeared already, even more than once, under the preceding rules

---

21 *sâmnidhyân nishedho labhyate sâmkrtyasya mate 'varnapûrvo vakâro na lupyate yakâras tu lupyata eve 'ty arthah* [1]*v ây-* ---- [1] *ahâv* ---- *pûrvâcâryamatanivartakas tuçabdah sûtram idam eve 'shtam na tu pûrvadvayam*[2] *paradvayam*[3] *ca*

(1) W B om, O puts after the other example [2] O *purvasutrad* [3] B O om

22 *yakâravakârâv avarnapûrvâv ukârâukârâparâu lupyete yathâsamkhyam*[1] *mâcâkîyasyâ*[2] *"câryasya mate*[3] *âpa* ---- *yâ* ---- *evampaiâv iti kim ta* ---- *v ây-* ---- *lupyete iti 'ha punarârambhah pûrvasûtradvayasthitananah*[4] *sambandhaçankânirâkaranârthah*[5]

[1] O om, G M after *mate* [2] G M *mâyikayasyâ*, as in the rule itself [3] B G M *matena* [4] W *-tayanana*, B *tayana*, O *tananabha* [5] O om *çanka*, W *-tham*

âpa undantu (i 2 1¹), and *yâ oshadhayah* (iv 2 6⁴ ⁵ so W B, but G M O give instead *yâ jâtâ oshadhayah*, iv 2 6¹), to which O adds an example for *v*, namely *çatakratav ut* (i 6 12³ it ought, in illustration of the rule, to read *çatakrata ut*), putting it between the other two Counter-examples are *ta enam bhishajyanti* (ii 3 11⁴ we are to understand, apparently, that Mâcakîya would read *tay enam*), and *vâyav ishtaye* (ii 2 12⁸)

The commentator remarks in conclusion that the repetition of *lupyete* in the present rule (it was read above, in rule 19) is intended to remove all suspicion of the continued implication of the negative which forms a part of the two preceding rules

लेशो वात्सप्रस्यैतयोः ॥ २३ ॥

23 According to Vâtsapra, they are imperceptibly uttered.

It might admit of question whether the "they" here spoken of are final *y* and *v* in general, or only *y* and *v* followed by *u* and *o*, as specified in the last rule As things stand, the use of the demonstrative *etayoh* rather favors, though not unequivocally, the latter interpretation, and it is the one adopted by the commentator But if the preceding rule be restored to what we have suggested above as its more probable original form, then the *etayoh* will be very well in place here as referring to *y* and *v* in general, and this interpretation is supported by the fact that the Âth Pr (ii 24) and Pânini (viii 3 18) ascribe a like opinion to another grammarian, Çakatâyana, whose peculiar views upon the subject are likewise hinted at by the Vâj Pr (iv 126) As the meaning of *leça* is defined to be *luptavad uccâranam*, 'utterance as if omitted,' there is not much for the two opposing parties to contend about

न प्लुतप्रग्रहौ ॥ २४ ॥

24 Exceptions are protracted and *pragraha* vowels.

Such, namely, are exempt from the rules of combination—and not merely those given in this chapter, but also such as are found elsewhere for example, at ix 11,12 There is nothing about the

---

23 ¹*vâtsaprasya mata etayor*² *yakâravakârayor*³ *avarnapûrvayor leçah syât*¹ *leço nâma luptavad*⁴ *uccâranam etayor ity ukârâukâraparâu nirdiçati uktâny evo 'dâharanâni*

(1) B om, along with the rule ² Only in W ³ G M O *yavak-* ⁴ B *tam*

24 ¹*na khalu plutah pragrahaç ca*¹ *samdhividhim bhajete*² *yathâ astu---- te---- ityâdividhâu nishiddhe 'nyasminç câ 'nârabhyamâne*³ *prakrtivad*⁴ *bhavati*

(1) G M *plutâç ca pragrahaç ca etâu na khalu* ² W B O *-jate* ³ G M ''*rabh* ⁴ O *-tyâ*

rule pointing out that it has a bearing so extensive Only one example is given for each class *astu hî3 ity abrûtâm* (vii.1 6[1]), and *te enam abhi* (ii 5 6[5])

The commentator points out, as he did not take the trouble to do under rule 18 of this chapter, that, the rules of combination being thus suspended with reference to these two classes, and no other rule being given about them, they remain in their natural condition

All the Prâtiçâkhyas have rules equivalent to this (Rik Pr ii 27, Vâj Pr iv 84, Ath Pr iii 33 in the note to Ath Pr i 73 I overlooked the present precept of the Taittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya), none assumes that the pronouncing a vowel to be *pragraha* exempts it, *eo ipso*, from phonetic combination

परश्च परश्च ॥ २५ ॥

25 Also the remaining vowel

That is to say, the vowel remaining after the omission of the final *y* or *v* is, like those mentioned in the preceding rule, exempt from farther combination According to the commentator, the "also" (*ca*) of the rule brings forward "*y* and *v*," the fact of their constituting an exception is inferred from the neighborhood of the preceding rule, and *parah* means 'another,' and qualifies *samdhih* understood "no further combination takes place" This seems to me inadmissible, as there has been no suggestion of any such word as *samdhi* Perhaps *para* may be better understood of the vowel "following" the *y* and *v* of which the chapter has been treating It needs, at any rate, some violence to bring in the rule with the meaning which it is evidently intended to bear no one would have any right to guess, from its form and position alone, at what it is aimed

The commentator's examples are *âpa undantu* (i 2 1[1]) and *agra imam* (i 1 5[1]) In reply to the objection that it would be enough to state the implication of the rule as "where an omission has taken place" instead of "an omission of *y* or *v*," he brings up *se 'd u hotâ* (i 1 14[4]), *sâi 'nâ 'nîkena* (iv 3 13[2] et al), and *sâu 'shadhîh* (iv 2 3[3]), as examples of an elision of a final which does not prevent the further combination of its predecessor and its successor under the rules of this chapter

---

25 *cakârâkrshtayor yavakârayor lope sati parah [1]samdhir na bhavati[1] yathâ[2] âpa---- agra---- sâmnidhyân nishedho labhyate nanu lope satî 'ty[3] etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam yavakârayor iti kim se 'd---- [4]sâi---- [4] sâu---- ity âdi*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane[5]
daçamo 'dhyâyah

(1) G M *sandhividhir na bhavate* [2] G M om [3] W om *iti* (4) O om [5] O adds *prathamapraçne*

CHAPTER XI

CONTENTS 1, initial *a* elided after *e* or *o*, 2–18, exceptions, cases of retention of initial *a* after *e* or *o*, 19, dissident view as to the nature of the elision

लुप्यते त्वकार एकारौकारपूर्वः ॥ १ ॥

1 But *a* is elided when preceded by *e* or *o*

The subject of the omission or retention of initial *a* after final *e* or *o*, and of the accent thence arising, occupies the whole of this chapter and of the one next following, the cases of retention being mostly rehearsed in this No attempt is made, here any more than in the treatment of other similar matters in the work, to effect a real classification—much less, an explanation—of the facts dealt with Nor have I, on the other hand, drawn up such a classification, as I did for the Atharva-Veda (see Atharva-Prâtiçâkhya, under rule iii 54) Doubtless, if drawn up, it would show nearly the same state of things to prevail in the Tâittirîya as in the Atharvan text namely, that the elision is the greatly prevailing, almost exclusive, usage in the prose passages, while, in the metrical passages, the *a* is more usually retained where the metre requires its retention, and omitted where the metre requires its omission—although with numerous exceptions, of which the most regular is that the *a* is dropped in writing at the beginning of a *pâda*, where, of course, it was always retained in metrical utterance The general subject of the relation of the written and spoken texts to one another in regard to this special point is well worth an elaborate investigation, founded on all the Vedic texts

For the word "but" (*tu*) in the rule is given an alternative explanation Some, the commentator says, regard it as suspending the force of the exceptional rule x 24 others, as marking the discontinuance of the general direction "followed by a vowel," which has been in action since ix 10 As in other like cases heretofore, we have no good reason for applying it to any particular rule or phrase, it merely marks an abrupt transition to a new subject, somewhat exceptional in its relations to the principles already laid down The subject was, however, anticipated and provided for in rule ix 13

---

1 *ekârapûrva okârapûrvo vâ 'kâro*[1] *lupyate yathâ*[2] *te----* [3]*so----*[3] *tuçabdo na plutapragrahâv* (x 24) *iti nishedhasambandhavidhim*[4] *nivartayatî 'ti kecit svaraparâdhikâram nivârayatî*[5] *'ty apare samgirante* [6]*ekâraç câu 'kâraç câi 'kârâukârâu*[6] *ekârâukârâu pûrvâu*[7] *yasmât*[8] *sa tathoktah*

[1] all the MSS *akaro* [2] G M om [(3)] B om [4] G M *-bandhî*, O *-bandham* [5] G M *nivartayati* [(6)] in W only [7] B om [8] G M *yasya*

To illustrate the rule, only two phrases, both of frequent occurrence, are quoted namely *te 'bruvan* (ii.5 1[3] et al) and *so 'bravît* (ii 1 2[1] et al)

In the other Prâtiçâkhyas, the apparent loss of initial *a* after *e* or *o* is treated as an absorption of it into its predecessor, or a unification of the two See Ath Pr iii.53 and note, and rule 19 of this chapter, where a somewhat similar view seems suggested

All the MSS excepting B read in the rule *ekâraokârapûrvah*, and, where the rule is quoted (i 61 and ix 13), we have six cases of this reading against three of *ekârâuk-* But the former is simply an instance of the usage, so common in the commentary (see above, p 4), of separating, for the sake of clearness, the elements of compound words, or otherwise disregarding the rules of *sandhi*

अथालोपः ॥ २ ॥

2 Now follow cases of non elision

The rest of this chapter is occupied with an enumeration of the cases in which initial *a* is retained First, in rule 3, a number of passages are specified in which non-elision is the rule, and elision (as determined by the rules of the next chapter) is exceptional, then, in the following rules, more isolated cases are disposed of

धातारातिरुपवाजपेयजुष्टश्येनायोख्यध्रुवक्षितिरियमेव-
सायाग्निर्मूर्धारुद्रप्रथमोपोत्तमविकर्षविहव्यहिरण्यवर्णी-
ययाज्यामहापृष्ठ्ये ॥ ३ ॥

3 The *a* is not elided in the following sections those beginning with *dhâtâ râtih* and *upa*, those styled *vâjapeya*, those beginning with *jush a* and *çyenâya*, those styled *ukhya*, those beginning with *dhruvakshitih*, *iyam eva sâ yâ*, and *agnir mûrdhâ*, the first and the next to the last of the *rudra* chapter, and those styled *vikarsha*, *vihavya*, *hiranyavarnîya*, *yâjyâ*, and *mahâprshthya*

Here are pointed out not less than seventy-three sections or *anuvâkas*, in which *a* is not elided (except in the cases specified in the rules of the next chapter) Those designated by the annotation of their first words are i.4 44, 5 5 iii 1 10, 2 8 iv 3 4,11, 4 4 The *vâjapeya* sections are six, namely i 7 7–12 The *ukhya* sections (as pointed out above, under ix 20) are twenty, namely iv 1 1–10, 2 1–10 The *rudra* chapter is iv 5, containing eleven sections,

2 [1]*athe 'ty ayam adhikârah* [1] *alopa ucyata ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah* [2]*na lopo 'lopah* [2] *lopâbhâva ity arthah*

1) G M om (2) all MSS *na lopah alopah*

those here referred to, then, are iv 5 1,10 The name *vikarsha* belongs to five sections, namely iv 6 1–5 Three sections, iv 7 12–14, are styled *vihavya* The *hiranyavarnîya* section (as shown under ix 20) is v 6 1 The *yâjyâs* have been repeatedly the subjects of prescription in earlier chapters (iii 9,11, ix 30), they are twenty-three sections, namely i 1 14, 2 14, 3 14, 4 46, 5 11, 6 12, 7 13, 8 22 ii 1 11, 2 12, 3 14, 4 14, 5 12, 6 11,12 iii 1 11, 2 11, 3 11, 4 11, 5 11 iv 1 11, 2 11, 3 13 The *mahâprshthya* sections, finally, are the first six of those which (as seen under ix 20) bear the name *prshthya*, they are iv 4 12, 6 6–9, 7 15

Section i 4 44 is quoted by its two first words, instead of by *dhâtâ* only, according to the commentator, because of the occurrence in another *çâkhâ* of a section beginning *dhâtâ devebhyo 'surân* (G M omit *asurân*) Again, iv 3 4 is quoted by *dhruva-kshitih*, instead of by *dhruva* (the first *pada* of *dhruva-kshitih*, i 48), because *dhruva* (by i 22) would include *dhruvah*, and there is another section beginning with this word, and containing cases of elision, *dhruvo 'si dhruvo 'han sajâteshu bhûyâsam* (ii 3 9[1] only G M have the last two words), which would otherwise be violations of the rule Yet again, to quote iv 3 11 by *iyam* simply would not answer, because i 2 4 begins with *iyam te çukra tanûr*, and contains a case of elision, *sagarbhyo 'nu sakhâ sayûthyah* (i 2 4[2] only O has the last word, G M omit the example) But why quote by so long a phrase as *iyam eva sâ yâ*, of which the last two words are unnecessary? To this objection there is an alternative answer some say that it is for the benefit of the dull-minded, others, that it is intended to include a verse which, though occurring in another place (at i 4 33), is a remainder to this, and which contains the case of non-elision *o te yanti ye aparîshu paçyân* (i 4 33 G M O omit *paçyân*) Now it is true that the single verse constituting i 4 33 is of kindred subject with iv 3 11, and in the Rig-Veda forms part of the same hymn (i 113) with parts of the latter, and it is also true that the combination *ye aparîshu* is not otherwise authorized by the Prâtiçâkhya, but it is, of course, little less than absurd to assert that an excessive

---

3 [1]*dhâtârâtir ity*[1] *âdishv anuvâkeshv ekârapûrva okârapûrvo vâ 'kâro na lupyate* [2]*dhâtâ râtir* (i 4 44) *ity atra yathâ*[2] *nidh-.... râtir iti kim dhâtâ devebhyo 'surân iti çâkhântare* [3]*upaprayanto adhvaram* (i 5 5) *ity atra yathâ*[3] *âre.... deva savitah pra suva* (i 7 7) *ity* [4]*âdi shadanuvâkânâm*[4] *vâjapeyasamjñâ* [5]*atra yathâ*[5] *te no.... te agre.... jushto vâca* (iii 1 10) [6]*ity atra yathâ*[6] *yas.. ..* [7]*yo....*[7] *çyenâya* [8]*patvane* (iii 2 8) *ity atra yathâ*[8] *namah.... viçve.... ukhye yathâ*[9] *çrnv-.... namo.... dhruvakshitir* (iv 3 4) [10]*ity atra yathâ*[10] *viçve.... ûrmir....* [11]*kshitir iti kim dhruve 'ty* [12]*akârântasya yadi*[12] *grahanam syât*[11] *dhruvo.... ity atra bhaved*[13] *iti*[14] *iyam eva sâ yâ* (iv 3 11) [15]*ity atra*[15]

quotation of the beginning of the one *anuvâka* has any right, or can have been intended, to include the other The right of i 4 33, it may be remarked, to stand in the text to which our Prâtiçâkhya applies, is assured by the contemplation of others of its phonetic phenomena by rules found elsewhere (most unequivocally by vi 5), its case of non-elision would seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise, but discovered by the commentators, some of whom have tried to force it violently within the ken of their rules It is necessary to quote iv 4 4 by two words, because i 6 3 also begins with *agnih*, and in it we find *yo me 'nti dûre 'râtîyati* (i 6 3[1] the example is wanting in G M) Finally, instead of *prshthya* passages, the *mahâprshthya* are specified, because of such cases as *prthivî te 'ntarikshena* (v 2 12[2] the *anuvâka* is *prshthya*, but not *mahâprshthya*)

The commentator cites one or more examples from each of the sections or sets of sections which the rule specifies, as follows From the section beginning *dhâtâ râtih* is taken *nidhipatir no agnih* (i 4 44[1]), it contains three more cases, and one exception From that beginning with *upa* comes *âre asme ca* (i 5 5[1]), it contains six other cases, and one exception From the *vâjapeya* sections, *te no arvantah* (i 7 8[2]) and *te agre açvam â 'yuñjan* (i 7 7[2]), they contain eleven examples, and eleven exceptions The section beginning with *jushta* yields *yas te añçuh* (iii 1 10[1]), and O alone adds *yo drapso añçuh* (iii 1 10), there are two other cases, and no exception From the *çyenâya* section, *namah pitrbhyo abhi* (iii 2 8[3]) and *viçve arupâ edhate* (iii 2 8[4]), there are four other cases, and two exceptions From the *ukhya* sections, *çrnvanti viçve amrtasya putrâh* (iv 1 1[2] only W has *putrâh*) and *namo astu sarpebhyah* (iv 2 8[3]), they yield seventy-five cases, and forty-five exceptions From the section *dhruvakshitih* are cited the only two examples, *viçve abhi grnantu* (iv 3 4[2]) and *ûrmir drapso apâm asi* (iv 3 4[3] only G M have *asi*), there are no exceptions From the section beginning *iyam* etc are taken *ketum krnvâne ajare* (iv 3 11[1] G M omit *ketum*) and *trayo gharmâso anu* (iv 3 11[1]), there are three other cases, and one exception The

---

ketum---- trayo---- iyam ity [16]*etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam* [16] *iyam te çukra tanûr* (i 2 4) *ity* [17]*atra sag---- ity atra mâ bhûd iti sâ ye 'ti padadvayam*[17] *mandadhiyâm pratipattyartham iti kecit anye tv anyathâ kathayanti asyâ 'nuvâkasya çeshabhûtâ* [18]*ya rg*[18] *anyatra sthitâ sâ 'pi* [19]*svîkartavye 'ti*[19] *o te---- agnir mûrdhâ* [20]*diva* (iv 4 4) *ity atra yathâ*[20] *sa---- enâ---- mûrdhe 'ti kim agnir mâ durishtâd* (i 6 3) *ity atra* [21]*yo me ----*[21] *rudrapraçnasya prathamopottamânuvâkayor yathâ*[22] *namo---- drâpe---- uta---- uttamasya pûrvatah*[23] *samnikrshta upottamah açmann ûrjam* (iv 6 1) [24]*ity atrâ 'nuvâkapañcasya*[24] *vikarshasamjñâ tatrâ*[25] *'nyam---- pâvako---- vâjo nah sapta pradiça*[26] (iv 7 12) *ity atrâ*[27] *''dyanuvâkatra-*

first example here is not well chosen, since the *e* of *krnvâne* is *pragraha*, and *pragrahas* are not contemplated in the general rules for elision see xii 8 and note From the *agnir mûrdhâ* section, *sa yojate arushah* (iv 4 4[4]) and *enâ vo agnim namasâ* (iv 4 4[4] O omits *namasâ*), there are three other cases, and one exception From the specified sections of the *rudra* chapter are taken *namo astu nîlagrîvâya* (iv 5 1[3]), *drâpe andhasas pate* (iv 5 10[1]), and *uta mâ no arbhakam* (iv 5 10[2]), they afford fourteen cases, and five exceptions From the *vikarsha* sections, *anyam te asmat tapantu* (iv 6 1[3,5] only W has *tapantu*) and *pâvako asmabhyam* (iv 6 1[1] etc), there are thirty-three cases, and ten exceptions From the *vihavya* sections, *viçve adya marutah* (iv 7 12[1] O omits *marutah*) and *viçve devâso adhi vocatâ me* (iv 7 14[2] only O has *viçve*), ten cases and five exceptions The *hiranyavarnîya* section affords three cases only, of which one is cited, *eko devo apy atishthat* (v 6 1[3]) The *yâjyâ* sections afford a hundred and twenty-nine cases, with thirty-eight exceptions, the selected examples are *supathâ râye asmân* (i 1 14[3], repeated at i 4 43[1]) and *kâmena krto abhy ânat* (i 1 14[2] W B O end with *abhi*) From the *mahâprshthyas*, finally, come *vivasvad vâte abhi nah* (iv 4 12[4]) and *somo adhi bravîtu* (iv 6 6[4] O adds *no ditim*, doubtless for *no 'ditih*, which follows in the text), they contain thirty eight cases and nine exceptions

This rule, accordingly, disposes at one stroke of three hundred and fifty-one cases of the retention of *a*, but it is at the cost of creating a formidable body of exceptions, a hundred and thirty-one in number, which have to be provided for by the counter-rules of the next chapter—while, once more, a considerable number of the cases falling under the rule have to be individually specified, partly in that chapter and partly in the two following rules of this, as exceptions under the counter rules It is a complicated process, but it successfully attains at last its purpose

---

yasya vihavyasamjñâ tatra[28] *viçve----* *viçve----* *hiranyavarnîye*[29] *yathâ*[30] *eko----* *yâjyâsu yathâ*[31] *supathâ----* *kâmena----* *samid diçâm* (iv 4 12) *jîmûtasya* (iv 6 6) *yad akrando* (iv 6 7) *mâ no mitro* (iv 6 8) *ye vâjinam* (iv 6 9) *agner manve* (iv 7 15) *iti*[32] *shannâm eshâm*[33] *anuvâkânâm mahâprshthyasamjñâ tatra* [34] *vivasvad----* *somo ---* *mahe 'ti kim prthivî----*

(1) W B *rati 'ty* (2) G M *krameno 'dâharanani* (3) G M *upa* only (4) G M *adinâm shannam an-* (5) G M *tatra* (6) G M om (7) in O only (8) G M om, W omit *yathâ* 9 G M om (10) G M om (11) G M *kshitigrahanam*, O adds *tadâ* after *syat* (12) O *etavanmatrasya* 13 G M *mâ bhud*, O *api bhavet* 14 O om (15) G M om, O adds *yathâ* (16) G M *ukte*, B adds *kim anyaih*, O *etâvata 'lam kim ebhi* (17) G M *atra 'pi 'ty adhikopadanam* (18) W O *yâ rg*, G M *yâ rk*, B *yam rg* (19) W B *svikaroti*, O adds *yathâ* (20) G M om (21) G M *ma bhud iti* 22 G M om 23 W *purvah* (24) G M *iti praçnasya aditah pañcânuvakânam*, O *adi* for *atra* 25 O *tatra yathâ* 26 G M om 27 G M O om *atra* 28 G M om, O *yathâ* 29 G M *-rnah* 30 G M om 31 G M om 32 B om 33 G M put before *shannâm* 34 O ins *yathâ*

अंहसोंऽहतिरनिष्टृतोऽवन्त्वस्मानवद्यादहनि च ॥४॥

4 Also in *anhasah*, *anhatih*, *anishtrtah*, *avantv asmân*, *avadyât*, and *ahani*

The cases of non-elision referred to are as follows for *anhasah*, *pramuñcanto no anhasah* (iv 3 13[5]), for *anhatih*, *pari dveshaso anhatih* (ii 6 11[2]), for *anishtrtah*, *vardhatâm te anishtrtah* (iv 1 7[2]), for *avantv asmân*, *te avantv asmân* (ii 6 12[3]), with a counter-example, *te no 'vantu pitaro haveshu* (ii 6 12[4] only G M have *haveshu*), to prove the necessity of giving *asmân* along with *avantu* in the rule, for *avadyât*, *mitramaho avadyât* (i 2 14[6]), and for *ahani*, *çucih çukre ahany ojasînâ* (iv 4 12[1] G M O stop at *ahani*) All of them occur in passages which are the subject of the preceding rule, and the commentator points out that the "also" (*ca*) of the rule brings forward the implication of those passages, and that to any of the words specified, if occurring elsewhere in the text, the rule does not apply, citing as example *sa evâi 'nam pâpmano 'nhaso muñcati* (ii 2 7[4] all but G M stop at *anhasah*) At first sight, then, the rule appears to be a superfluous repetition of part of the cases involved in the preceding one, in fact, however, its value is that of a rehearsal of exceptions under rule xii 4, which teaches that even in the sections above specified, an *a* before a *y*, *v*, *n*, or *h*, if those letters be followed by a vowel, is elided The only thing calling for explanation about the matter is the connection in which the counter-exceptions are given, which is, to say the least, quite peculiar

अनु घर्मासआपोमर्तोरथस्त्वोदत्तेवातःपूर्वः ॥५॥

5 Also in *anu*, when preceded by *gharmâsah*, *âpah*, *martah*, *rathah*, *tvah*, *datte*, and *vâtah*

This rule belongs, in part, in the same category with the preceding, as pointing out cases in which the *a* of *anu* is retained according to rule 3 of this chapter, notwithstanding the prohibition of rule xii 4, but in part it is of a more general character, since the last two cases lie outside the sections specified in rule 3

---

4 [1] *cahâro dhâtârâtir* (xi 3) *ityâdivishayânvâdeçakah*[2] *anhasah* ...... *ity eteshu grahaneshu dhâtârâtirityâdisthaleshv*[3] *ehârapûrvo vâu*[4] *'hârapûrvo vâ*[5] *'kâro na lupyate yathâ*[6] *pram-* .... *pari* .... *vardh-* .... *te* .... *asmân iti kim te no* .... *mitr-* ... *çucih* .... *yavanahaparatvâd*[7] (xii 4) *eshu prâpyamânalopeshv*[8] *alopo 'yam*[9] *vihitah anvâdeçah kimartham sa* ....

[1] G M ins *eteshu grahaneshu* [2] G M *-disthalavish* [3] B adds *antarvartishu*, G M *-lapattishu*, O *-lavartishu satsu* [4] G M O om *va* [5] O om [6] G M O om [7] W *ratv*, G M *-hasvarapar-* [8] G M ins *satsu* [9] W om, B *na*

The commentator explains the phraseology used as signifying that the words rehearsed, having their final *visarga* [with the preceding *a*] converted to *o* [of course, excepting *datte*], have the office of preceding causes—that is, of producing an effect upon the word that follows them, but he gives no hint of the partial suspension of the implication made in the preceding rule, intimating rather, that the cases rehearsed are all of them exceptions under rule xii 4 He quotes the passages, as follows *trayo gharmâso anu* (iv 3 11[1]), *tasmâd âpo anu sthana* (v 6 1[3]), *yadâ te marto anu* (iv 6 7[3]), *anu tvâ ratho anu* (iv 6 7[3]), *pîyati tvo anu tvah* (iv 2 3[4] only G M have the last word), *çukram â datte anuhâya jâryâi* (iii 2 2[2] G M O omit *jâryâi*), and *dhanus tad vâto anu vâtu te* (v 5 7[3 4] O ends with *anu*) To show that other words than *anu* are not relieved from the action of xii 4, he gives us *amushmin loke vâto 'bhi pavate* (v 4 9[4] all but G M begin at *vâto*), and further, to show that *anu* retains its *a* only after these words, *anu gâvo 'nu bhagah kanînâm* (iv 6 7[3] only G M O have the last word)

I have noted ten cases in which the *a* of *anu* is elided under the operation of rule xii 4

अभिवातवपश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also (after *vâtah*) in *abhi vâtu* and *apah*

The *ca*, 'also,' here brings down as *pûrvanimitta* simply *vâtah*, the word last specified in the preceding rule The cases have nothing to do with xi 3 they are *mayobhûr vâto abhi vâtû 'srâh* (vii 4 17[1] G M omit the first word, and they alone have the last), and *yad vâto apo agamat* (vii 4 20 O omits *agamat*), and, as counter-examples, the commentator quotes *vâto 'bhi* (v 4 9[4]) to show the necessity of giving *vâtu* after *abhi* in the rule, and *ava rundhe 'po 'gre 'bhivyâharati* (vi 4 3[2] G M omit the last two words) to attest the implication conveyed by the *ca*

अन्वगमच्च ॥ ७ ॥

---

5 *atra visargântânâm otvam âpannânâm pûrvanimittatvam*[1] *iti*[2] *vijñeyam gharmâsah------ ity evampûrva anv ity atrâ 'kâro na lupyate yathâ trayo*[3]*---- tasmâd---- yadâ---- anu---- pîyati---- çukram---- dhanus*[3]*---- anv iti kim amushmin---- evampûrva iti kim anu---- yavanahaparatvanishedhârtho*[4] *'yam ârambhah*

[1] W G M *-mittam* [2] O om [(3)] a *lacuna* in B [4] G M *yavanahasvarapa*, O *-shedhanisheçârtho*

6 *cakâro vâta ity anvâdiçati abhi vâtu apah ity etayor akâro vâtahpûrvo na*[1] *lupyate mayo----- vâtv iti kim vâto ----* [2]*yad----*[2] *anvâdeçena kim ava----*

[1] G M ins *khalu* [(2)] G M put before *vâtv* etc

7 Also (after *apah*) in *anu* and *agamat*

Here, again, the *ca*, 'also,' brings forward only the last word in the preceding rule, namely *apah*—and what is more, gives that word a new character, changing it from *nimittin* to *nimitta* or affecting cause Of this the commentator takes no notice, and we are doubtless to regard it as quite in order, and as merely adding another to the formidable list of uncertainties involved in the curious system of *anuvrtti* or continued implication The passages had in view are *apo anv acârisham* (i 4 45[3],46[2] B reads *apo adyâ 'nv*, which is the version of the Rig-Veda, i 23 23) and *apo agamad indrasya* (vii 4 20), as counter-example, is given *paçavo 'nû 'd âyan* (ii 1 5[1]), to prove the implication of *apah*

आपःपूर्वो ऽद्भिरपांनपादस्मान् ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also in *adbhih*, *apâm napât*, and *asmân*, when preceded by *âpah*

The passages are *sam âpo adbhir agmata* (i 1 8), *devîr âpo apâm napât* (i 2 3[3] vi 1 4[9], 4 3[3]), and *âpo asmân mâtarah çundhantu* (i 2 1[1] O omits *çundhantu*) The necessity of specifying *napât* after *apâm* is shown by *vârunîr âpo 'pam ca* (ii 1 9[2]), and the restriction to preceding *âpah* by *so 'smân pâtu* (v 5 5[1])

रायेसइन्द्रःपूर्वश्चाकारपरे ॥ ९ ॥

9 In *asmân*, also, if followed by *a*, when *râye*, *sah*, and *indrah* precede

The *ca*, 'also,' again brings down the word last mentioned in the preceding rule The passages for *sah* and *indrah* are *mâ so asmân̆ avahâya* (v 7 9[1]) and *indro asmân asmin dvitîye* (iii 1 9[2] O omits *dvitîye*) and other cases of *asmân* after *sah* are to be found at i 6 6[4] and iii 2 7[2] As counter-examples, are given *so 'smân pâtu* (v 5 5[1]), to show that the *asmân* must be followed by *a*, and *smo 'smân amutra* (vi 6 1[4] all the MSS of the commentary have the false reading *so 'smân*, such a phrase would be precisely out of place here as illustration), to show that it is only

---

7 *apa iti cakâro 'nvâdiçati anu agamat ity etayor akâro* [1]*na khalv*[1] *apahpûrvo lupyate apo anv---- apo ag---- evampûrva iti kim paçavo---*

(1) G M O om *khalu*, and put *na* next before *lupyate*

8 *adbhih------ eteshv*[1] *akâra âpahpûrvo na lupyate sam --- devîr---- napâd iti kim vârunîr- -- âpo---- evampûrva iti kim so----*

1 G M *eshv*, O *eshu grahaneshv*

after the words specified that *asmân*, even before *a*, remains unmutilated

The other case, that of preceding *râye*, makes more difficulty, since the *samhitâ* contains no passage in which *asmân*, when itself followed by *a*, has *râye* before it The commentator first declares the passage had in view to belong to another text (*çâkhâ*), but adds, as an alternative explanation, that the precept relates to the *jaṭâ*-text, where we read *râye asmân asmân râye râye asmân* (i 1 14³, 4 43¹) He proceeds further to say that, in case any one objects that in the *samhitâ* form of the passage the example does not hold good, since *asmân* is not there followed by *a* (it reads *râye asmân viçvâni*), he shall reply that the case is one falling under i 61 It is there taught, namely, that a passage of three words or more, if repeated in the text, reads as it read on its first occurrence now the one in question first appears in i 1 14, which is a *yâjyâ* section, and hence the *a* of *asmân* is retained by xi 3, at i 4 43, then, its retention is assured But then there ought to be no necessity for specially establishing its retention in *jaṭâ*, any more than in any other case where an *a* is retained in *samhitâ* This difficulty the commentator evidently perceives, although he does not state it, for otherwise the *jaṭâ* explanation would have satisfied him, and he would never have thought of suggesting another *çâkhâ* The difficulty really remains unsolved, and a serious one either there was a blunder on the part of the makers of the treatise, or a passage not contained in the present Sanhita was contemplated by them I incline to think the former more likely

तेपूर्वो ऽद्यान्धोऽंशुरग्ने ॥ १० ॥

10 Also in *adya*, *andhah*, *ançuh*, and *agne*, when *te* precedes

The commentator quotes the passages, as follows *paçum paçupate te adya* (iii 1 4¹ W O omit *paçum*), *upo te andhah* (i 4 4 and iii 4 2¹), *ançunâ te ançuh* (i 2 6 B omits the example), and *yat te agne tejas tena* (iii 5 3² only B has *tena*) Counter-examples are, first, to show that only these words keep their *a* after *te*, *te 'gnaye pravate* (ii 4 1² B has a corrupted reading, *te enam*, and W a *lacuna* to the end of the comment, putting in place of it an example from under the next rule, *tena tvâ " dadhe 'gne angirah*),

---

9 *cakâr âkrshte 'smângrahane 'kârapare sati*[1] *vartamâno*[2] *'kâro râye sa indra ity*[3] *evampûrvo na lupyate râyepûrvasyo 'dâharanam çâkhântare* [4]*atha vâ*[4] *jatâyâm bhavati · râye.... yathâsamhitâyâm*[5] *no 'dâharanam akâraparatvâbhâvât*[6] *tarhi*[7] *katham alopa*[8] *iti kecit*[9] *tripadaprabhrtipunaruktatvâd iti brûmah mâ .... indro ... akârapara iti kim. so... evampûrva iti kim smo.... akârah paro yasmât* [10]*tad akâraparam*[10] *tasmin*

[1] in W only [2] G M put before *'karapare* [3] G M O om [(4)] O om [5] G M O ins *tu* [6] W O *-patvâbh*, G M *parabh-* [7] O *tathâ*, G M add *tadâ* [8] G M *lopa* [9] G M O *cet* [(10)] W *tad akâm*, G M *akâraparah*

and second, to show that these words do so only after *te*, *prathamo 'ñçu skandati* (iii 8³ only B has *skandati*)

Of *agne* after *te*, the text presents eighteen other cases namely i 2 11² twice, 4 43², 5 2⁴,3²,4³, 6 6², 7 6⁴ iii 4 10⁵, 5 3² (a second case) v 4 7⁵, 7 4¹,6³,8¹ three times vi 2 2⁷, 6 1²

मेपूर्वश्च ॥ ११ ॥

11 In *agne*, also, when preceded by *me*

Only *agne*, the last word of rule 10, is brought down into this The commentator quotes *yan me agne asya* (i 6 2¹,10² W B omit *asya*) and *imâ me agna ishtakâh* (iv 4 11³,⁴ and v 4 2⁴), and there is another case in iv 4 11⁴ He adds, as usual, a number of counter-examples, of obvious intent they are *tena tvâ " dadhe 'gne añgirah* (i 2 12¹ O omits *añgirah*), *prânaç ca me 'pânah* (iv 7 1¹), and *tad açakam tan me 'râdhi* (i 6 6³)

अस्याश्विनापरा च ॥ १२ ॥

12 As also, in *asya*, *açvinâ*, and *aparâ*

That is to say, when these words follow *me* The passages are *viyantu devâ havisho me asya* (i 5 10³ O begins at *devâ*), *punar me açvinâ yuvam cakshuh* (iii 2 5⁴ W B omit the last word, O the last two), and *yad vâ me aparâgatam* (vi 6 7²)

नःपूर्वो ऽसदग्निरघान्तमोऽभ्यस्मिन्नद्यपथि ॥ १३ ॥

13 Also in *asat*, *agnih*, *agha*, *antamah*, *abhi*, *asmin*, and *adya pathi*, when preceded by *nah*

The examples are *supârâ no asad vaçe* (i 2 3¹ and vi 1 4⁴), *ayam no agnir varivah* (i 3 4¹ and i 4 46³, there is another case of *no agnih* at v 7 9¹), *rakshâ mâkir no aghaçansa îçata* (i 4 24 and

---

10 *adya...... eteshv*¹ *akâras ta ity evampûrvo na lupyate yathâ*² *paçum... upo.... *³*añçunâ....*³ *yat.... eteshv iti kim *⁴*te.. .*⁴ *tepûrva iti kim prathamo....*⁴

¹ O *eshu* ² in W only ⁽³⁾ B om ⁽⁴⁾ W om, and ins *tena tva* etc

11 ¹*cakâro 'gna ity anvâdiçati mepûrvo 'gna ity atrâ 'kâro*¹ *na lupyate yathâ*² *yan.... imâ.. .. mepûrva iti kim tena.... anvâdeçena*³ *kim *⁴*prânaç....*⁴ *tad....*

⁽¹⁾ B *cakârakrshte saty agna ity asminn akaro ma ity evampurvo*, G M the same, omitting *sati*, O the same, omitting *sati* and the second *iti* ² in W only ³ O *-ça iti* ⁽⁴⁾ O om

12 *mepûrva iti cakâro 'nvâdiçati asya......*¹ *eteshv*² *akâro mepûrvo na lupyate vi-.... punar.... yad....*

¹ G M ins *iti* ² O *eshv*

iv 6 6[4] G M O omit *îçata*), *agne tvam no antamah* (i 5 6[3] and iv 4 4[8]), *svishtim no abhi vasîyah* (iii 1 9[2] G M O omit *vasîyah*), *çiksha no asmin* (vii 5 7[4]), and *tebhir no adya pathibhih sugebhî rakshâ ca nah* (vii 5 24 all but W end with *pathibhih*) The necessity of including *pathi* in the rule is shown by *no 'dya vasu vasatî 'ti* (ii 5 3[6 7]) Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are *tasmâd açvâd gardabho 'sattarah* (v 1 2[1] G M omit the first two words), *so 'gnir jâtah* (v 1 4[1]), *uttarato 'ghâyur abhidâsati* (v 7 3[1] B O omit the last word), *te 'sminn âichanta* (vii 2 10[1]), *namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhâya* (i 5 10[1] the example is found only in G M), and *te nah pântu te no 'vantu* (i 2 3[1], 8 7[1] iv 3 3[2])

नमःपूर्वो ऽग्रेऽश्वेभ्योऽग्रियाय ॥ १४ ॥

14 Also in *agre*, *açvebhyah*, and *agriyâya*, when preceded by *namah*

The passages are *namo agrevadhâya ca* (iv 5 8[1]), *namo açvebhyo 'çvapatibhyah* (iv 5 3[2] B omits the last word, the whole example is wanting in W), and *namo agriyâya ca* (iv 5 5[2]) Counter-examples are *apo 'gre 'bhivyâharati* (vi 4 3[2]) and *namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhâya* (i 5 10[1])

आविन्नःसोमःपूर्वो ऽग्निपरः ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also when *âvinnah* or *somah* precedes and *agni* follows

It may be made a question whether the rule should not read *gniparah* (without sign of omission), and mean 'also an *a* preceded by *âvinnah* or *somah* and followed by *gni*' But the authority of the comment (see below) is decidedly, though not unequivocally, in favor of what I have given, and the construction, though a peculiar one, has its analogies elsewhere in the treatise (compare x 4 etc) The further difficulty remains, however, that the only passages in the text to which the rule can apply read *agnih*, in the nominative singular, after the two words specified, so that there appears to be no reason why we should not have simply *'gnih*, instead of *'gniparah* This the commentator does not fail to perceive,

---

13 *asat* ------ *eteshv akâro na ity evampûrvo na lupyate yathâ*[1] *suparâ* ---- *ayam* ---- *rakshâ* ---- *agne* ---- *svishtim* ---- *çikshâ* ---- *tebhir* ---- *pathî 'ti kim no* ---- *nahpûrva iti kim tasmâd* ---- *so* ---- *uttarato* --- *te* ---- *eteshv iti kim* [2]*namo* ---- [2] *te* ----

[1] in W only [(2)] in G M only

14 [1]*agre* ------[1] *eteshv akâro namahpûrvo na lupyate namo* --- [2]*namo açv* ----[2] *namo agri* --- *namahpûrva iti kim apo* ---- *eteshv iti kim namo 'gn* ----

[(1)] O om [(2)] W om

and accordingly—resorting, as we cannot well help saying, to one of his usual subterfuges—he declares *agni* (or, according to W B O, *gni*) "a part of a word, intended to include a number of cases occurring in another *çâkhâ*," not going so far, however, as to quote any of these cases I suspect *'gniparah* to be either a corruption of *'gnih*, or originally intended as equivalent with it

The passages are *âvinno agnir grhapatih* (i 8 12[2]) and *somo agnir upa devâh* (iii 2 4[1]), and the commentator adds counter-examples, *so 'gnir jâtah* (v 1 4[1]) and *âvinno 'yam asâu* (i 8 12[2])

धीरासोऽदब्धासएकादशासऋषीणांपुत्रःशार्यातेऽषाढःपि-
तारःपृथिवीयज्ञआसतेयेगृह्णाम्यग्रेवाँएषयज्ञेसंस्फानोयु-
वयोर्यःपृष्ठेपतिर्वोगोशुष्मःपुवःसमिद्धऋषभःपाथोवचोव-
र्षिष्ठेजुषाणोयोरुद्रोवृष्णःपूर्वः ॥ १६ ॥

16 Also *a* is retained when preceded by *dhîrâsah*, *adabdhâsah*, *ekâdaçâsah*, *rshînâm putrah*, *çâryâte*, *ashâdhah*, *pitârah*, *prthivî yajñe*, *âsate ye*, *grhnâmy agre*, *vân eshah*, *jajñe*, *sansphânah*, *yuvayor yah*, *prshthe*, *patir vah*, *go*, *çushmah*, *puvah*, *samiddhah*, *rshabhah*, *pâthah*, *vacah*, *varshishthe*, *jushâno*, *yo rudrah*, or *vrshnah*

The passages had in view are quoted as follows *tâm dhîrâso anudrçya yajante* (i 1 9[3] G M O omit the last word), *adabdhâso adâbhyam* (i 1 10[2] and iii 5 6[1]), *ekâdaçâso apsushadah* (i 4 11), *rshînâm putro adhirâja eshah* (i 3 7[2] G M O omit the last word), with a counter-example, *yasya putro jâtah* (i 5 8[5], 7 6[2]), to show the need of including *rshînâm* in the *nimitta*, *yathâ çâryâte apibah* (i 4 18 G M omit *yathâ*), *ashâdho agnih* (i 5 10[1,2]), *tvatpitâro agne devâh* (i 5 10[2] G M O omit *devâh*), *prthivî yajñe asmin* (i 6 5[1]), with a counter example, *te mâ 'smin yajñe* (iii 2 4[1]), where, as only W B point out, the *jaṭâ*-text shows the mutilation of *asmin* after *yajñe* not preceded by *prthivî* (thus, *asmin yajñe yajñe 'sminn asmin yajñe*), *adhyâsate ye antarikshe* (iii 5 4[3]), with *ye prthivyâm ye 'ntarikshe* (iv 5 11[2] only O has the first *ye*) as counter-example, *mayi grhnâmy agre agnim* (v 7 9[1,2]), with *ashtâu krtvo 'gre 'bhi shunoti* (vi 4 5[1] O omits *shunoti*) as counter-example, *idâvân esho asura* (i 6 6[4] and iii 1 11[1]), with *çukra esho 'nto 'ntam manushyah* (vii 2 7[2] O stops at

---

15 *âvinnah somah* [1] *evampûrvo* [2]*'kâro 'gniparo*[2] *na lupyate agnî*[3] *'ti padâikadeçah çâkhântare bahûpâdânârthah âvinno ---- somo---- evampûrva iti kim so---- evampara iti kim âvinno----*

[1] G M ins *ity* [(2)] G M *agni ity evamparah akaro*, B *akârah agniparo* [3] W B O *gnî*

'ntam) to show the need of *vân*, *itah prathamam jajñe agnih* (ii 2 4[8] only G M have *itah*, without it, also i 3 14[5]) see what is said of this passage, and of the rule as fixing its reading, under i 61, *sañsphâno abhi rakshatu* (iii 3 8[2]), as counter-example to which, to show that *sphânah* in the rule would not have been enough, is given *gayasphâno 'gnishu* "from another *çâkhâ*," but the genuineness of the reason is open to doubt, *yuvayor yo asti* (iii 5 4[1]) with *yo psu bhasma praveçayati* (v 2 2[5] only O has the last word) to prove the need of *yuvayoh*, *nâkasya prshthe adhi rocane divah* (iii 5 5[3] G M O omit *divah*, another nearly identical case at iii 5 4[1]), *yajñapatir vo atra* (v 7 7[1]), with *na vo 'bhâgâni havyani* (v 1 1[1] O omits *havyam*) as counter-example, *goargham eva somam karoti* (vi 1 10[1] O omits *-mam karoti*, *goargha* occurs twice more in this section, and at v 2 9[4] we have *goaçva* twice), to which, by rule i 52, *agoargham* (vi 1 10[1] three times) is to be added as further example, *uchushmo agne yajamânâyai 'dhi* (i 6 2[2] only G M have *edhi*, and O omits also the preceding word, there is a second case, of *niçushmah*, in the same division), *agrepuvo agregnvah* (i 1 5[1]), *samiddho añjan* (v 1 11[1] and we have *samiddho agne* at i 6 6[2], 7 6[4] ii 5 8[6]), without any counter-example to show that *iddhah* would not have been enough to answer the needs of the rule, *dyâm rshabho antarikshham* (i 2 8[1] O omits *dyâm*, and G M have, like the Calcutta edition, the false reading *yâm*), *priyam pâtho apî 'hi* (iii 3 3[3] three times), *ugram vaco apâ 'vadhîm* (i 2 11[2] another nearly identical case in the same division), *varshishthe adhi nâke* (i 1 8 and i 4 43[2]), *jushâno aptur âjyasya vetu* (i 3 4[1] and vi 3 2[2] G M omit *vetu*), *yo rudro agnâu yah* (v 5 9[3] G M O omit the last word), and, as counter-example, *yad upatrñhyâd rudro 'sya* (vi 3 9[3] but O reads *âçnîyâd* for *upatrñhyâd*, which makes the reference to i 6 7[4]), and, finally, *vrshno açvasya samdânam asi* (ii 4 7[2],9[4] O stops at *açvasya*, which would make the reference include also vii 4 18[2] twice, and there are further cases of retention after *vrshnah* at i 4 2 and vi 4 5[3])

---

16 *dhîrâsah*...... *evampûrvo na*[1] *khalv*[2] *akâro lupyate yathâ*[3] *tâm*.... *adab-*.... *ekâd-*.... *rshînâm* .. *rshînâm iti kim yasya*.... *yathâ*.... *ash-*... *tvat-*.... *prthivî*.... *prthivî 'ti kim te*.... [4]*ity atra jatâyâm*[4] *adhy-*.... *âsata iti kim ye*.... *mayi* ... *grhnâmî 'ti kim asht-*.... *idâvâñ*.... *vân iti kim çukra*.... *itah*.... *sañs-*.... *sam iti kim gayasphâno 'gnishv iti çâkhântare yuvayor* .... *yuvayor iti kim yo*.... *nâkasya*.. .. *yajña-*.... *patir iti kim na*.... *yo-*.... *apy akârâdi* (i 52) *vacanâd*[5] *agoargham* [6]*iti co 'dâharanam*[6] *uchushmo*.... *agrepuvo* .... *samiddho*.... *dyâm*.... *priyam*.... *ugram*.... *varsh-* ... *jushâno*.... *yo*.... *ya iti kim* · *yad*.... *vrshno*....

[1] O puts next before *lupyate* [2] O om [3] G M O om [(4)] G M O om [5] O

अरतिमस्ययज्ञस्यातिद्रुतोऽतियन्त्यनृणोऽविष्यन्ननमीवाऽन्नेष्वर्चिरजीतानज्यानिमह्नियाअम्बाल्यर्वन्तमस्त्वकृणोदङ्गिरोऽप्सुयोअस्कभायदच्युतोऽश्वसनिरस्थभिरशिश्रेदङ्गेऽघ्निय ॥ १७ ॥

17 Also in *aratim*, *asya yajñasya*, *atidrutah*, *ati yanti*, *anrnah*, *avishyan*, *anamîvah*, *anneshu*, *arcih*, *ajîtân*, *ajyânim*, *ahniyâh*, *ambâli*, *arvantam*, *astu*, *akrnot*, *añgirah*, *apsu yah*, *askabhâyat*, *acyutah*, *açvasanih*, *asthabhih*, *aciçret*, *añge*, and *aghniya*

The passages had in view are quoted by the commentator as follows, with such counter-examples as are needed to justify the inclusion of more than one *pada* in any case *mûrdhânam divo aratim prthivyâh* (i 4 13 and vi 5 2[1] O begins at *divah*, and it alone has *prthivyâh*), *yan me agne asya yajñasya* (i 6 2[1],10[2]), with the counter-example *ete 'syâ 'mushmin* (vi 1 10[5]), *pratyañk somo atidrutah* (i 8 21 all the MSS here insert the *k* before *somo*, as required by v 32, and G M even convert it to *kh*, according to xiv 12), *paçyanto ati yanti* (iii 2 2[1]), and, as counter-example to both these last examples, *nai 'nañ somo 'ti pavate* (vi 5 11[4] O begins at *somo*), *tad agne anrno bhavâmi* (iii 3 8[2] O omits *bhavâmi*), *na yavase avishyan* (iv 4 3[3]), *svâveço anamîvo bhavâ nah* (iii 4 10[1] B O omit *bhavâ nah*), *ye anneshu vividhyanti* (iv 5 11[1] O omits the last word), *jâtavedo yo arcih* (v 7 8[1]), *çarado ajîtân* (v 7 2[3]), *teshâm yo ajyânim* (v 7 2[3]), *tiroahniyâ mâ suhutâh* (vii 3 13 O omits *suhutâh*), *ambe ambâli* (vii 4 19[1,2] twice, [3] twice), *yo arvantam jighânsati* (vii 4 15 O omits the last word), *bahis te astu bâl iti* (iii 3 10[2] O stops at *astu*, the text furnishes eleven other cases of *astu* with *a* retained, at i 2 3[3], 4 45[1], 8 14[2] iii 1 1[4], 2 5[7],8[2] v 5 9[3] twice, 7 2[4],4[3,4]), *ita indro*-

---

17 *aratim* ---- [1] *eteshv akâro 'na khalv*[2] *ekârapûrva okârapûrvo vâ lupyate yathâ*[3] *mûrdh-* ---- *yan* ---- *yajñasye 'ti kim ete* ---- *pratyañ* ---- *paçy-* ---- *drutoyantî 'ty âbhyâm*[4] *kim nai* ---- *tad* ---- *na* ---- *svâv-* ---- *ye* ---- *jâtavedo* ---- *çarado* ---- *teshâm* ---- *tiro-* ---- *ambe* ---- *yo* ---- *bahis* ---- *ita* ---- *agne* ---- *yo* ---- *ya iti kim açvo* ---- *yo* ---- *madâya* ---- *yo* ---- *sanir iti kim açvebhyo* ---- *indro* ---- *bhir*[5] *iti kim* [6]*çam* ---- *ity atra*[7] *jatâyâm*[6] *asthabhyo* ---- *varuno* ---- *añge-* ---- *aghniye 'ty akâragrhîtah padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah etâni* ---- *yad* ---- *payo* ----

[1] G M om the enumeration, and ins *iti* [(2)] G M om *khalu*, and put *na* next before *lupyate* [3] G M O om [4] B *tâbhyam*, G M *etâbhyam* [5] B G M *asthabhir* [(6)] O om [7] B om

akrnot (i 1 12), *agne añgiro yo 'syâm* (i 2 12[1] there is another case in the same division, and one at vi 2 7[3]), *yo apsu ya oshadhîshu* (v 5 9[3]), with the counter example *açvo psuyo vetasah* (v 3 12[2] but O gives instead *yo 'psu bhasma*, v 2 2[?]), *yo askabhâyad uttaram* (i 2 13[3] G M O omit *uttaram*), *madaya raso acyutah* (i 2 6), *yo bhaksho açvasanih* (iii 2 5[7]), and, as counter-example, *açvebhyo 'çvapatibhyaç ca* (iv 5 3[2] only O has *ca*), *indro dadhico asthabhir iti* (v 6 6[3] O omits *iti*), and a counter-example from the *jatâ*-text of the passage *çam asthabhyo majjabhyah* (v 2 12[2] O omits), namely *asthabhyo majjabhyo majjabhyo 'sthabhyo 'sthabhyo majjabhyah* (G M give simply *majjabhyo 'sthabhyah*), *varuno açiçret* (i 8 10[2]), *añge-añge ni dedhyat* (i 3 10[1] and vi 3 11[2] it would have been better to include in the example the preceding word *prâno*, to show that the first *añge*, as well as the second, furnishes an example under the rule, there is another like pair of cases, after *apâno*, iii 1 3 10[1]), and finally, it is explained that the quotation of *aghniya* with final *a* makes it (by i 22) a part of a word, intended to include a variety of cases, and three such cases (being all that the text contains) are quoted namely *etâni te aghniye nâmâni* (vii 1 6[8]), *yad âpo aghniya varune 'ti çapamahe* (i 3 11 B omits the last word, G M O the last three), and *payo aghniyâsu hrtsu* (i 2 8[1] O omits *hrtsu*, which would make the citation include also vi 1 11[3]) This exposition seems to prove that the proper reading at the end of the rule is *aghniya*, and I have ventured to adopt it, though all the MSS (except T, which is ambiguous, running rules 17 and 18 together in *sandhi*) give *aghniyâ* *Aghniyâ* would answer as including *aghniyasu*, but it would not include also *aghniye*

अधर् स्वरपरे ॥ १८ ॥

18 Also in *adhvara*, when a vowel follows [the *r*]

The examples given in illustration of the rule are *satyadharmâno adhvare* (i 2 1[2]), *havishmân devo adhvarah* (i 3 12), and *upaprayanto adhvaram ity âha* (i 5 7[1]) In regard to the last of them, it is remarked that rule i 61 is not of force for it, since the conditions imposed by that rule do not arise in it The rule, namely, directs that a passage of three words or more, being repeated in the text, is to be read as where it first occurred; now *upaprayanto adhvaram* was found at i 5 5[1], where the retention of the *a* comes under rule 3 of this chapter, but here only two

18 *adhvara ity asmin*[1] *grahane svarapare* [2] *vartamâno 'kâro* [3]*na khalv*[3] *ekârâukârapûrvo*[4] *lupyate. satya-.... havishmân .... upa-....' atra*[5] *tripadaprabhrti* (i 61) *nyâye na prasarati*[6] *tallakshanâsambhavât svarapara iti kim çuç .. andho....*

[1] G M *etasmin* [2] O ins *sah* [3] G M om [4] G. M O *ekârapurvo okârapûrvo vâ*, G M adds *na*, B adds *vâ* [5] M *tatra*. [6] B *sarati*.

words, instead of three, are cited in the repetition As counter-examples, showing the value of the restriction "when a vowel follows," are given *çug vâ agnih so 'dhvaryum* (v 6 2[4]) and *andho 'dhvaryuh syât* (v 1 3[1] and vi 1 8[3] O alone has *syât*, and, without that addition, the phrase is found also at v 1 3[2]) This proves that what is to be "followed by a vowel" is the *r* of *adhvara*, but how that meaning is conveyed by the terms of the rule is not easy to discover The MSS are at variance as to the reading of the first word of the rule, T W B O giving *adhvara*, and G M *adhvare*, between which I am at a loss to decide confidently, because neither of them appears to be what is wanted But I prefer *adhvara*, both because it is better supported, and because it is not the usage of the treatise to put in a case-form the words or themes which it cites from the text

An additional case falling under the rule is *ûrdhvo adhvarah* (i 1 12), and yet others (as i 5 5[1] twice, and, doubtless, i 4 46[2 3]), to which it would else apply, are disposed of under the general rule xi 3

स पूर्वस्यार्धसदृशमेकेषामर्धसदृशमेकेषाम् ॥ १९ ॥

19 In the opinion of some, it becomes half-similar with its predecessor

This is a very blind precept, and we are permitted to doubt whether its purport is interpreted aright by the commentary, in which, moreover, there are peculiar and unintelligent variations of reading What letter is the subject of the rule—the elided *a*, or the non-elided? The comment says the latter (although the majority of MSS blunderingly say the "non-protracted" instead), and states that it acquires a quantity similar to half a *mora*, or becomes one and a half *moras* long It is added, that no special examples are given, because such would not bring to light any difference (? only O has the reading that means this W B omit the "not," G M are unintelligible) This appears to me quite unsatisfactory The distinct demonstrative *sa* in the rule ought to point back to something distinctly stated above, and that is the

19 *yo 'yam akâro 'luptah*[1] *sa pûrvasyâi* [2]*'kârasyâu 'kârasya*[2] *vâ 'rdhamâtrasadrçam*[3] *kâlam bhajata*[4] *ity ekeshâm rshînâm*[5] *matam*[6] [7]*adhyardhamâtrah syâd*[7] *ity arthah uktâny evo 'dâharanâni viçeshâdarçanât*[8] *ardhena sadrço 'rdhasadrçah*[9] *tam ardhasadrçam*[10]

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarana [11]
ekâdaço 'dhyâyah [12]

[1] W B O *aplutah* [(2)] G M *ekâraokârapurvasya* [3] W *tram sad*, G M *-trâsad* [4] G M *labhata* [5] O *âcâryanâm* [6] O om [(7)] W O *-trasyam*, B G M *-tra syâd* [8] W B *-shadar-*, G M *darçanât* [9] G M *yah* [10] O om [11] O ins *prathamapraçne* [12] G M add *çrikrshnâya namah*

akâra which in rule 1 is said to be dropped after certain "predecessors" We have had no *akâra alupta* spoken of, but only cases of *alopa* of *akâra* And it seems to be taught here, in accordance with the doctrines of all the other Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath Pr iii 53), that some regard the *a* as (not elided, but) so absorbed into the preceding diphthong as to become assimilated to, or identified with, the latter half of that diphthong We may with plausibility conjecture the rule to be a later addition to the original substance of the chapter

---

CHAPTER XII

CONTENTS 1–8, elision and non elision of initial *a* after final *e* or *o* in exceptional and special cases, 9–11, resulting accent

अथ लोपः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for cases of elision

This is a general heading to the chapter (that is to say, to its first eight rules), which, as the commentator points out, has for its sphere of action the passages specified in rule 3 of the preceding chapter This is a matter of course the general rule (by xi 1) being elision, there can be need of an additional authority for elision only where that rule is contravened by another of opposing character, and of wider application than to specific cases only

असि ॥ २ ॥

2 The *a* of *asi* is elided

The examples given are *suparno 'si garutmân* (iv 1 10^5, 6 5^3 v 1 10^5 O omits the last word) and *pratho 'si pṛthivy asi* (iv 2 9^1 O stops at *'si*) The elision is not infrequent in this word, usually occurring in the little prose phrases which are inserted among the verses in the sections concerned, I have noted eighteen other cases but they are hardly worth detailed reference

न गर्भःसंनद्धोयमोभद्रःपूर्वः ॥ ३ ॥

---

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah akârasya lopa ucyata ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah* *dhâtârâtir* (xi 3) *ityâdivishayo 'yam adhyâyârambhah*[1]

[1] G M *etadadh-*

2 *asî 'ty asminn akâro lupyata ekârâukârapûrvah*[1]. *yathâ*[2] *suparno....* *pratho....*

[1] G M *-rvo vâ* [2] in B only

3 But not when *garbhah*, *samnaddhah*, *yamah*, or *bhadrah* precedes

The examples quoted by the commentator are *garbho asy oshadhînâm* (iv 2 3[3]), *samnaddho asi vîdayasva* (iv 6 6[5]), *asi yamo asy âdityah* (iv 6 7[1] G M O omit the last word), and *tvam bhadro asi kratuh* (iv 3 13[1]) There is another case of *asi* after *garbhah* at iv 1 4[2], which is then repeated at v 1 5[3], the *a* standing this time unelided by rule i 61

As usual, the commentator thinks it necessary to account for the inclusion of the double *pada sam naddhah*, instead of simply *naddhah*, in the rule Some, he says, quote as counter-example *upanaddho 'surah* (iv 4 9), but its propriety is questionable, since the passage does not fall under xi 3, and moreover, there is no *asi* in it (O has the good sense to pass without notice this most absurd suggestion), and the valid counter example is to be sought in another *çâkhâ* We have here an unusually clear example of the arbitrary way in which the plea *çâkhântare* is resorted to, in order to avoid the attribution of a slight inconsistency to the treatise makers.

यवनह्परः स्वरपरेषु ॥४॥

4 *A* is elided before *y*, *v*, *n*, and *h*, when these are followed by a vowel

The examples given are *hiranyaçrñgo 'yo asya pâdâh* (iv 6 7[4] O omits *pâdâh*), *vanaspate 'va srjâ rarânah* (iv 1 8[3] O omits *rarânah*), *varenyo 'nu prayânam* (iv 1 10[4]), and *jambhayanto 'him vrkam* (i 7 8[2] O omits *vrkam*) These are but specimens selected from among a considerable number of cases namely, before *y*, two, before *v*, nineteen, before *o*, fourteen (all but three of them, cases of *anu*, the counter-exceptions to which form in part the subject of xi 5), before *h* (which, as the counter-exceptions noted in xi 4 show, includes also *ñh*), five, in all, forty To show the necessity of the restriction "when these are followed by a vowel," are cited *çukram te anyat* (iv 1 11[2]) and *agre ahnâñ hitah* (iv 1 3[4] O omits *hitah*)

There is a well-established difference of reading here in the rule itself T B G M have *yavanaha svarupareshu*, only W and O adding *para* (which I have amended to *parah*) after *ha* So also,

---

3 *garbhah*...... [1] *evampûrvah sâmnidhyâl labdhe 'si*[2] *'ty asmin grahane*[3] *'kâro* [4] *na*[5] *lupyate garbho*.... *samnaddho* .... [6]*sam iti kim upan-*.... *iti kecid udâharanti tac cintyam dhâtârâtir* (xi 3) *ityâdyantahpâtitvâbhâvâd asiçabdâdarçanâc* [7]*ca mukhyam tu*[7] *çâkhântare vijñeyam pratyudâharanam*[6] *asi*.... *tvam*....

[1] G M ins *ity* [2] W *tasminn asi* [3] B O om [4] G M ins *ekârapûrva okara pûrvo vâ* [5] B om [(6)] O simply *udâharanam çâkhântare* [(7)] W *câ 'mukhyam kimtu*

where the rule is quoted under i 21, W alone (there is no O for that part of the work) introduces *para*, under xi 4 and 5, W and B alike have *yavanahaparatva* etc, but the testimony as to the rule is equivocal, since *para* might well have been added there by way of exposition instead of quotation I have, as usual, followed W, although not without suspicion that the *para* is a gloss, introduced to help the otherwise blind and inaccurate phraseology of the rule—which latter, however, is not altogether discordant with the usage of the treatise elsewhere

The exceptions under this rule, instead of being rehearsed after it, as is the general habit of the Prâtiçâkhya, are given in rules 4 and 5 of the preceding chapter, and, in the latter rule, mingled with instances of a wholly different character Here, then, a particular specification of cases already included under a general rule is regarded as insuring against inclusion in a more general statement of exceptions under that rule I believe that the treatise offers no other example of this canon of interpretation

जकारग्नपर उदात्तः ॥५॥

5 Before *j* and *gn*, *a* is elided if acute

The examples are *ojo 'jâyathâh* (i 6 12[4]) and *çucih pâvaka vandyo 'gne* (i 3 14[5]), and the counter-examples, of *a* unaccented remaining unelided, are *ná tatrshânó ajárah* (iv 6 1[2]) and *nidhipátir no agníh* (i 4 44[1]) There is, as the examples show, a real reason in the accent *ájâyathah* and *ágne* are both words that are accented only at the beginning of a *pâda*, where (as remarked under xi 1) the elision of *a* is an almost universal rule All the other cases of elision before *gn* (nine in number) are of the same kind, not, however, those before *j* (only two)

मोवचोदधानस्थेपूर्वश्च ॥६॥

6 Before *gn*, also when preceded by *mah*, *vacah*, *dadhânah*, and *sthe*

The *ca*, 'also,' of this rule, brings down simply *gn* from its predecessor, the intent being to point out the cases where the *a* of *agni* is elided even when unaccented *Mah*, it is stated, is a part

4 [1] *yakâravakâranakârahakârapâro 'kâro*[2] *lupyate teshu yakârâdishu svarapareshu satsu hiran-.... vanas-.... varenyo .... jambh-.... svarapareshv*[3] *iti kim çukram.... agre ....*[4]

[1] G M ins *ekâraokârapûrva akârah* [2] G M om [3] O *para* [4] G M add *evam âdi*

5 *jakâraparo*[1] *gnaparaç câ 'kâra*[2] *udâtto lupyate ojo....' çucih.... udâtta iti kim na.... nidhi-....*

[1] G M *jakâraç ca* [2] O puts after *udâtto*

of a word, so given for the sake of conciseness, and including the two cases *añgirasvad ache 'mo 'gnim* and *añgirasvad bharishyâmo 'gnim* (both iv 1 2² O omits *añgirasvad* in each) The other passages had in view by the rule are *vaco 'gnaye bharatâ brhat* (iii 2 11¹ O omits the last two words), *dadhâno 'gnir hotâ* (iv 1 3⁴), and *sadhasthe 'gnim purîshyam* (iv 1 3¹ O omits *purîshyam*) To prove the implication of *gn* only, is given *sadhasthe adhy uttarasmin* (iv 6 5³, 7 13⁴ v 7 7² O omits)

By xi 16, *vacah* does not as a general thing elide the following *a*, but there is no clashing between the two rules, as they have reference to different parts of the text

अभ्यावर्तिन्नपूपमपिदधाम्यद्यान्वदितिःशर्माग्नेर्जिह्वामग्न-
यःपप्रयोऽस्माकमस्मेधत्ताश्माश्वाश्युतिरश्यामामार्यमन्नस्म-
त्पाशानस्मिन्यज्ञेऽस्ताव्यथमानाभिद्रोहमधाय्यदोऽथोऽदु-
ग्धाअरिष्टाअरथाअर्चन्त्यन्तरश्यामत्रस्थान्नायाङ्गिरस्वदकरम्

॥ ७ ॥

7 The *a* is elided in *abhyâvartin*, *apûpam*, *api dadhâmi*, *adyâ 'nu*, *aditih çarma*, *agner jihvâm*, *agnayah paprayah*, *asmâkam*, *asme dhatta*, *açmâ*, *açvâ* wherever found, *acyâma*, *amâ*, *aryaman*, *asmatpâçân*, *asmin yajñe*, *astâ*, *avyathamânâ*, *abhidroham*, *adhâyi*, *adah*, *atho*, *adugdhâh*, *arishtâh*, *arathâh*, *arcanti*, *antar asyâm*, *atra stha*, *annâya*, *añgirasvat*, and *akaram*

The commentator gives an example for each specification of the rule, with counter-examples for every case in which more than one *pada* is taken, as follows *agne 'bhyâvartin* (iv 2 1²), and, as counter-example, *kâmena krto abhy ânad arkam* (i 1 14² G M omit the last word, O the last two), *bhadraçoce 'pûpam deva* (iv 2 2³ only W has *deva*), *agne 'pi dadhâmy âsye* (iv 1 10²), and, as counter-example, *baddho apikaksha âsani* (i 7 8³ O omits the last word), *anu no 'dyâ 'numatih* (iii 3 11³ iv 4 12⁵, 7 15⁵), and, as counter-example, *pra tat te adya çipivishta nâma* (ii 2 12⁵ O ends with *adya*, and G M substitute another passage,

6 *gnapara iti cakâro jñâpayati mah------ ity evampûrvo gnaparo* [1]*'nudâtto 'py*[1] [2]*akâralopo bhavati*,[2] *yathâ*[3] *añgi----- ma ity* [4]*atra padâikadeçagrahanam*[4] *samkshepârtham añgir- ---- vaco---- dadhâno---- sadhasthe----* [5]*anvâdeçah kimarthah* [5] *sadh----- gnaparasyâ 'kârasyâ*[6] *'nudâttârtho 'yam ârambhah*

(1) in W only (2) G M O *akâro lupyate* 3 in W only (4) G M *apadagrahanam* (5) G M *anvâdeçena kim*, O om, along with the following example 6 in W only

namely *viçve adya marutah*, iv 7 12[1]), *adhi bravîtu no 'ditih çarma yachatu* (iv 6 6[4] G M O omit the first two words), and, as counter-example, *yathâ no aditih karati* (iii 4 11[2] only O has *karati* [reading it *karat*], G M substitute a *jatâ* reading, *aditir no no aditir aditir nah*, without anything to show whether it is put forward as the *jatâ*-text of this passage, or of another, occurring at iv 6 9[4], where the *samhitâ* likewise reads *no aditih*), *adhvaram no 'gner jihvâm abhi grnîtam* (iv 1 8[2] B omits the last word, O the last two, G M the last and first), and, as counter example, *vratâ dadante agneh* (iv 1 8[2]), *te no 'gnayah paprayah* (i 7 7[2]), and, as counter-example, *purîshyâso agnayah prâvanebhih* (iv 2 4[3] G M omit the last word), *naro 'smâkam indra* (iv 6 6[7], there are two other cases, at iii 2 8[6] and iv 6 4[3]), *viçve 'sme dhatta* (i 4 44[2]), with the counter-example *dravinam vâjo asme vâjasya mâ* (iv 7 12[1] only B has *mâ*, and G M O end at *asme*), *pari vrndhi no 'çmâ bhavatu nas tanûh* (iv 6 6[4] G M end with *'çmâ*, and only O has the last two words), for the phonetic complex *açvâ* however followed, *vrshapânayo 'çvâ rathebhih* (iv 6 6[3] O omits after *'çvâ*), *pracetaso 'çvân* (iv 6 6[5]), and *bharanto 'çvâye 'va* (iv 1 10[1] O omits this example), with two counter-examples, *cashâlam ye açvayûpâya takshati* (iv 6 8[2] O alone has the last word, and it omits the first) and *kshatram no açvo vanatâm* (iv 6 9[4] O omits *vanatâm*), to show that *açva* would not have answered the purpose instead of *açvâ*, *vâjayanto 'çyâma dyumnam* (i 3 14[3] G M omit *dyumnam*), *punas te 'mâi 'shâm* (iv 7 14[3]), *ye te 'ryaman* (ii 3 14[4]), *te 'smatpâçân* (iv 3 13[4]), with the counter-example *anyam te asmat tapantu* (iv 6 1[3,5] v 4 4[5] only O has *tapantu*), *yah pitâ te 'smin yajñe* (ii 6 12[6]), with the counter-example *te asmin javam â 'dadhuh* (i 7 7[2]), *prasitim drûnâno 'stâ*

---

7 *abhyâvartin ...... eteshv akâro lupyate ekârâukârapûrvah*[1] *yathâ*[2] *agne .... âvartinn*[3] *iti kim kâmena .... bhadraçoce .... agne .... dadhâmî 'ti kim baddho .... anu .... anv iti kim pra .... adhi .... çarme 'ti kim yathâ .... adhv- .... jihvâm iti kim vratâ ... te .... paprayа iti kim purîsh- .... naro .... viçve .... dhatte 'ti kim drav- .... pari ....* [4] *açve 'ty asya*[5] *yatrayatra çrutis*[6] *tatratatra lopah vrsha- .... çrutir iti kim prace- .... bhar- .... dîrghagrahanena* [7] *kim cashâlam .... kshatram .... vâjay- .... punas .... ye .... te .... pâçân iti kim anyam .... yah .... yajña iti kim te .... prasitim .... mâ .... jane .... droham iti kim brhas- .... upa .... ye .... mahyam .... çûra .... pûrve .... ye ... gâya- .... abhi .... asyâm iti kim rukmo ... ye .... sthe 'ti kim tvashtâ .... râyas .... prthivyâh .... aham ....*

[1] G M put before *lupyate*, and add *vâ* [2] G M O om [3] W *abhyâv-* [4] O ins *açvâ çrutih* [5] G M O om [6] G M *çrûyate* [7] G M ins *iti*

'si (i 2 14[1] O omits *prasitim*), *mâ suparno 'vyathamânâ* (iv 2 9[1]), *jane 'bhidroham manushyâh* (iii 4 11[6] O omits *manushyâh*), with a counter-example, *brhaspate abhiçaster amuñcah* (iv 1 7[4] only W has *amuñcah*), *upa prâ 'gât sumanme 'dhâyi manma* (iv 6 8[3] all but O begin at *sum-*, and G M end with *'dhâyi*), *ye 'do rocane divah* (iv 2 8[3] O omits *divah*), *mahyam agne 'tho sîda* (iv 1 9[3], 2 1[5]), *çûra nonumo 'dugdhâh* (ii 4 14[2]), *pûrve 'rishtâh syâma* (iv 7 14[2] all the MSS read *-shtâ*), *ye pavayo 'rathâh* (i 6 12[6] only G M have *ye*), *gâyatrino 'rcanty arkam* (i 6 12[2 3] only G M have *arkam*), *abhi çûçuco 'ntar asyâm* (iv 1 9[3], another case at iv 2 3[3]), with the counter-example *rukmo antar vi bhâti* (iv 1 10[4 5] et al), *ye 'tra stha purânâh* (iv 2 4[1]), with the counter-example *tvashtâ no atra varivah* (i 4 44[1]), *râyas posho 'nnâya tvâ* (i 7 9[2] O omits *tvâ*), *prthivyâh sadhasthe 'ngirasvat* (iv 1 6[1,2] four times, other cases at iv 1 1[3,4] three times), and *aham tebhyo 'karam namah* (iv 5 1[3])

गाह्मानोजायमानोहेतयोमन्यमानोवनस्पतिभ्यःपते-
स्रिधस्तपसःस्वधावोभामितोऽग्नयश्चायोऽध्वर्योक्रतोपूर्वः

॥ ८ ॥

8 An *a* is elided when preceded by *gâhamânah*, *jâyamânah*, *hetayah*, *manyamânah*, *vanaspatibhyah*, *pate*, *sridhah*, *tapasah*, *svadhâvah*, *bhâmitah*, *agnayah*, *âyo*, *adhvaryo*, and *krato*

The quoted passages are *gâhamâno 'dâyah* (iv 6 4[2]), *jâyamâno 'hnâm ketuh* (ii 4 14[1]), *hetayo 'nyam asmat* (iv 5 10[5]), *manyamâno 'martyam* (i 4 46[1]), *vanaspatibhyo 'dhi sambhrtâm* (iv 6 1[1] O omits the last word), with the counter-example *namah pitrbhyo abhi* (iii 2 8[3]), *annapate 'nnasya* (iv 2 3[1] and [by i 61] v 2 2[1]), *niho ati sridho 'ty acittim* (iv 1 7[3] O omits the first two words), *tapaso 'dhi jâtah* (iv 2 10[4]), *deva svadhâvo 'mrtasya dhâma* (iii 1 11[6] O omits the first word and the last), with the counter-example *anyâ vo anyâm avatu* (iv 2 6[3] O omits the last word), *bhâmito 'mitrasyâ 'bhidâsatah* (i 6 12[5] O omits the last word), *yân agnayo 'nvatapyanta* (iii 2 8[3] O omits *yân*), *agne 'dabdhâyo 'çîtatano* (i 1 13[3] O omits *agne*), *adhvaryo 'ver apâsh* (vi 4 3[4] O ends at *'veh*), and *çatakrato 'nu te dâyi* (ii 5 12[5])

A special explanation is required for the passage in which *agnayah* occurs, since the following *pada* is *anu*, which might seem to

---

8 *gâhamânah* ...... *ity evampûrvo*[4] *'kâro lupyate yathâ*[2] *gâh-* .... *jây-* .... *hetayo* ... *many-* .... *vanas-* .... *vanaspatî 'ti kim namah* *anna-* .... *niho* .... *tapaso* .... *deva* .... *svadhe 'ti kim* *anyâ* .... *bhâmito* .... *yân* ... *ukârasya vakâravikriyâyâm vyañjanaparo nakâra*[3] *iti yavanaha* (xii 4) *nishedhâbhâvâd alope prâpte tadapavâdo*

fall under xii.4 Its inclusion here is necessary, because in *saṁhitâ* the word becomes *anv*, so that its *n* is no longer "followed by a vowel," as required by that rule The question might arise, whether rule i 51 would not, at any rate, cause *anv* to be implied along with *anu*, but the commentator does not raise it, and the course taken by the treatise is evidently the more reasonable and safer one

The last three cases which the rule deals with are of a peculiar character, and quite different from all the rest falling under this chapter, being those in which a final *pragraha* or uncombinable vowel elides an initial *a*, either in the passages specified in xi 3 (like the last of the three) or elsewhere (like the other two) This the commentator points out, and declares that in every other instance the *a* remains after a *pragraha* I have already noticed (under iv 6,7) what the usage of the text is after *pragrahas* in *o* that, against the two cases here mentioned of *a* elided after a vocative in *o*, there are but two in which the *a* remains, but that after a final *o* containing the particle *u* we have twenty-one cases of *a* retained, and no case of its elision The passages where *a* is retained after an *e* that is *pragraha*, I have omitted to note but there is a considerable number of them, including many (e g i 4 30 ii 5 6[5] vi 3 5[3] vii 5 3[2] the commentator cites a single one, *ime açvinâ samvatsarah*, v 6 4[1]) where the retention is not otherwise authorized so that inability to cause elision is unquestionably involved in the very character of a *pragraha* vowel, according to the view of the treatise, and needs not to be expressly stated At this we have a right to be surprised, especially for two reasons first, that it is thought necessary to teach (see x 24) that *pragrahas* are not liable in general to combination with the initial vowels that follow them, and secondly, that according to this treatise there is no combination of the initial *a* with the preceding *e* or *o*, but an actual loss of it, leaving the *e* or *o* unaffected (except sometimes as to accent) But the essential character of the *pragraha* vowels, the reason of their peculiar treatment, and the proper significance of the term by which they are called, are obscure points as yet in Hindu phonetics and nomenclature

It remains to inquire how complete and accurate is the enumeration by the Prâtiçâkhya of the cases of elision or non-elision of *a* occurring in the Tâittirîya Sanhitâ I have, in looking through the Sanhitâ, carefully considered every case with reference to the rules of the treatise, and the result is that, apart from *ye aparîshu*

'yam agne---- adhvaryo---- çatakrato---- atra yavanaha (xii 4) *ityâdinâi 'va lope siddhe punar asya grahanam niyamârtham âyo 'dhvaryo*[4] *krato ity etatpadatrayapûrvasyâi 'vâ*[5] *'kârasya*[6] *lopo na tv itarapragrahapûrvasye*[7] *'ti yathâ ime----*

[1] G M *-vas tv* [2] G M O om [3] B *rapara* [4] O *âdh-* [5] B om [6] O *kâra.* [7] B *itaratra pr-*

(i 4 33) already treated of under xi 3 (p 244), I have found only two cases of *a* retained which are not accounted for namely *ûrdhvo asthât* (v 2 1[5], R-V x 1 1) and *so agnih* (v 2 3[3], R-V vii 1 16), and both these I suspect to fall under i 61, I having failed to note the previous occurrence of the passages Of cases explained by i 61 there is a considerable number, only, as was remarked under that rule (see p 47), there are three among them to which, if the commentator's forced interpretation of its terms be admitted, it cannot be made to apply Of cases of elision of *a* unaccounted for, I have found none Of course, my examination of the Sanhita, having been made by the help of a single *samhitâ* manuscript, is not to be credited as absolutely accurate yet I have a good deal of faith in the trustworthiness of its result

तस्मिन्ननुदात्ते पूर्व उदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ ९ ॥

9 When the elided *a* is grave, the preceding diphthong, if acute, becomes circumflex

All the Prâtiçâkhyas, and the usage of the known Vedic texts, are in accord upon this point (see note to Ath Pr iii 55) To the particular circumflex hence resulting, the treatise gives later (xx 4) the name *abhinihata*, the others call it *abhinihita* The examples given are *tè 'bruvan* (ii 5 1[3] et al) and *sò 'bravît* (ii 1 2[1] et al)
The representation of the tone of the elided *a* in the resulting accent of the eliding diphthong, of course, favors the view that regards it as absorbed into the latter, rather than elided

उदात्ते चानुदात्त उदात्तम् ॥ १० ॥

10 When it is acute, the preceding diphthong, if grave, becomes acute

This, also, is a universal usage The commentator quotes two examples *áva rundhatê 'satram vâ'i* (vii 3 8[1] O omits *ava*) and *ánnapatê 'nnasya* (iv 2 3[1] and v 2 2[1])

स्वरितश्च सर्वत्र स्वरितश्च सर्वत्र ॥ ११ ॥

11 As also, in every case, if circumflex

The commentator explains *ca*, ' also,' as bringing down *udâtte*,

---

9 *yam*[1] *adhikrtyâ 'yam prabandha uktas tasminn*[2] *akâre 'nudâtte lupte sati pûrva ekâra okâro vo 'dâttah*[3] *svaritam âpadyate yathâ*[4] *tè---- sò----*

[1] G M *ayam* [2] G M *asm-* [3] G M put next after *purva* [4] in B only

10 *tasminn*[1] *evâ 'kâra udâtte*[2] *lupte sati*[3] *pûrva ekâra okâro vâ 'nudâtta udâttam âpadyate yathâ*[4] *ava---- anna-----*

[1] O *asm* [2] O puts next after *eva* [3] O om [4] in O only

'when the elided *a* is acute,' from the preceding rule, and *sarvatra*, 'in every case,' as signifying 'whether the circumflex be independent or enclitic' His examples are *bheshajám gávè 'çvâya* (i 8 6[1]) and *ójó 'jâyathâh* (i 6 12[4]), where the final syllables of *gáve* and *ójah* have the enclitic circumflex by xiv 29, and *átho 'kthyó 'thâ 'tirâtrâh* (vii 1 5[4] G M O omit the first word), where the final syllable of *ukthyàh* has the independent circumflex before the elision

We might perhaps also fairly conclude that *sarvatra* implies an inclusion of the case treated of in rule 9, and virtually teaches that a final circumflex, eliding an initial grave, is still circumflex

With this chapter ends the first *praçna*, or section, of the treatise The division into *praçnas* is a purely external and formal one, and (as I gave notice would be the case, in the Introductory Note to the Atharva Prâtiçâkhya) is made no account of in this edition References made to the succeeding chapters by section and chapter will easily be found by adding twelve to the number of the chapter as given

---

CHAPTER XIII

CONTENTS 1–3, loss of *m*, before semivowels and spirants, 4, its retention before *rajan* etc, 5–15, details of the occurrence of *n*, otherwise than as the result of *sandhi*, 16, interchange of *d* and *l*

अथ मकारलोपः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the omission of *m*

---

11 *udâtta iti caçabdo jñâpayati tasminn*[1] *akâra udâtte*[2] *sati sarva*[3] *ekâra okâro vâ svarita udâttam âpadyate bheshajam ---- ojo --- sarvatre 'ti vacanân nityasvarito*[4] *'pi tathâi 'va tad vidhânam syât atho----*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane dvâdaço 'dhyâyah
[5]*iti prathamah praçnah*[5]

[1] O *asm-* [2] G M ins *lupte*, O ins *ca lupte* [3] O *sarvatra*, G M *sarvatra-sthita* [4] O *ritasya* (5) O om, G M *prathamapraçnas samaptah harih om çubham astu om*, W adds 1 *hari hi om*, and, as prelude to the next section, *çrîganeçaya namah harih om*, B adds *harih om*

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah makâralopa*[1] *ucyata ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam* [2]*ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah*[2] *makârasya lopo makâralopah*[3]

[1] O *rasya l-* (2) W B om [3] B om

A general heading, of which, however, the force extends but a very little way (through rule 4) The subject is a supplement to that treated at v 27–31, where we are told what is done with *m* before a mute, or before any other semivowel than *r*

रेफोष्मपरः ॥ २ ॥

2 A *m* is omitted, when followed by *r* or a spirant

This omission of *m* is accompanied, according to xv 1–3, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or else the insertion of *anusvâra* after it Respecting the relation of these alternative views to one another, see the note to ii 30 The definition of the *m* as lost or omitted accords best with the former view it is sufficiently logical and consistent to say that the consonant is lost and the vowel nasalized, if, however, an *anusvâra*, as a separate vocal element, is to take the place of *m* after the vowel, the only acceptable form of statement must be that the *m* is directly converted into *anusvâra* This form of statement is in fact adopted by the Rik (iv 5) and Vâj (iv 1) Prâtiçâkhyas, which acknowledge an *anusvâra*, while the other is rightly preferred by the Ath Prat (ii 32, i 67), which holds the theory of the nasalized vowel our own treatise, as was pointed out above (p 68), trims between the two views

The commentator's examples are *pratyushtaň rakshah* (i 1 2[1] et al), *saňçitam me brahma* (iv 1 10[3] v 1 10[2]), *taň shad ahâni* (v 5 2[6]), *saň-sam id yuvase vrshan* (ii 6 11[4], iv 4 4[4] only G M have *vrshan*), and *tvaň ha yad yavishthya* (ii 6 11[1]) Counter-examples are given to show that *m* before other letters is not dropped, *idam vâm âsye* (iii 3 11[1]), to show that the dropped *m* must be a final, *tasmât tâmrâ âpah* (vi 4 2[4]) The commentator, namely, has quietly introduced the limitation *padântah*, 'when final,' into his explanation of the rule, without pointing out whence he derives it it comes, in fact, only from the general scope of the treatise, which thus far, having the relation of *pada* and *samhitâ* texts under treatment, has dealt almost exclusively with final and initial letters

यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. As also, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*.

---

2 *rephaparaç*[1] *co*[2] *"shmaparaç ca padânto*[3] *makâro lupyate yathâ*[4] *praty-.... saň-.... taň.... saň-.... tvaň.... *[5]*evampara iti kim idam.... padânta iti kim tasmât....*[5] *rephaç co "shmânaç*[6] *ca *[7]*rephoshmânah te pare*[7] *yasmât sa tathoktah.*

[1] W *rephaç* [2] O om *ca* [3] B *nte* [4] G M om (5) O om [6] G M O *mâ* (7) B G M O *rephoshmânâu tâu parâu*

The authorities here quoted are, as the commentator does not fail to point out, the same with those referred to above, in v 30, where we were taught that some teachers hold *m* not to be assimilated to a following *y* or *v*, any more than to *r*. The accepted teaching of the treatise, however, is (v 28–9) that *m* before *y*, *l*, and *v* becomes a nasal counterpart to those letters respectively whence the present rule is pronounced unapproved. For the bearings of the discordant doctrine, see note to v 30.

The examples are *tvañ yajñeshv îdyah* (i 1 14⁴, 2 3¹ ² O omits *îdyah*) and *tañ vâ etañ yajamânah* (v 6 9³ O omits the last word) the ordinary and approved reading would be *tvam*, *tam*, and *etam*—as all the MSS in fact read, neglecting the illustration of the opinion set forth in the rule. A counter-example is given, *yaṁ kâmayeta* (i 6 10⁴ et al.)

न सꣳस्रामिति रापरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. But not the *m* of *sam* and *sâm*, when followed by *râ*.

This is a precept applying only to the two words *samrâj* and *sâmrâjya*, and in the other Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath Pr ii 36) these words or the root *râj* are particularly specified, since, however, the syllable *râ* does not chance to occur in the Tâittirîya Sanhitâ except in these words after *sam* or *sâm*, there is no inaccuracy in the more general statement as here made. The examples of the occurrence of the words in question selected by the commentator as illustrations are *pra samrâjam* (i 6 12³) and *sâmrâjyâya sukratuh* (i 8 16¹ O omits *sukratuh*). As counter-examples, we have *çañ râjann oshadhîbhyah* (iii 2 3¹) to show that no other words

---

3 *yakâraparo* [1] *vakâraparo vâ makâro lupyata ity ekeshâm* [2] *matam ya evâ 'sya pañcamâdhyâye*[3] *savarnâpattim*[4] *pratishedhayanti*[5] *teshâm evâi 'sha lopavidhir iti tân anvâdiçati cakârah sinhâvalokanena*[6] *yathâ tvam---- tam---- evamipara iti kim yam---- yakâraç ca vakâraç ca yavakârâu tâu parâu yasmât sa tathoktah*

[7]*etat sûtram anishtam* [7]

[1] G M ins *vâ* [2] G M O ins *âcâryânâm* [3] B G M *mânuvâke* [4] B *savarnam agre vartinah*, G M *-napratip* [5] W B *-dhanti* [6] O *-kanunyâyena* [(7)] G M O *nâi 'tat sutram ishtam*

4 [1]*re 'ty*[1] *evamparah* [2]*samsâm ity etayor grahanayor*[2] *makâro na lupyate yathâ*[3] *pra---- sâmr---- sam sâm iti kim çañ---- râpara iti kim sañrarânah padântaç ca vyañjanaparah prâkrta* (xiv 28) *iti*[4] *vakshyamânam*[5] *dvitvanishedham itiçabdo*[6] *nivârayati tasmâd atra dvitvasiddhih* [7]

[(1)] the MSS, as usual in such a case, *râ ity* [(2)] G M put at beginning, O om *grahanayor* [3] in G M only [4] O om [5] G M *na* [6] G M *tuç* [7] G M add *itiçabdas sam sâm ity anayor eve 'ti samarthayati*

retain an unchanged *m* before *râ*, and *saṅrarânah* (i 4 44[1]) to show that only *râ*, not *ra*, effects the retention

According to W B O, the particle *iti* in the rule is intended to deny the application to the word here had in view of rule xiv 28, respecting duplication, and to assure the duplication of the *m* before the *r* But G M insert *tu*, 'but,' in the rule after *iti*, ascribing to it the effect just defined, and making the *iti* simply signify that the words mentioned, and no others, are the subjects of the rule And G (not M) writes the examples accordingly, *sammrâjam* and *sâmmrâjyâya* That this bit of constructive interpretation is a pure figment of the commentators does not need to be pointed out, respecting its occasion and bearing, see the note to xiv 28 I have adopted the reading of W etc, which is presumably the older and more genuine in the comment on xiv 28, even G M agree with the others in making *iti* the bond of connection between the two rules

अथ वर्णानाम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 Now of individual sounds

According to the comment on rule xxiv 2 (see the note to that rule), we have here one of the main division lines of the treatise Thus far, from the beginning of the fifth chapter, we have had to do chiefly with the combination of separate words or *padas* into connected text, now we turn to the determination of individual letters, which are read alike in both forms of text That the intention of the treatise-makers recognized so grand a transition here may be doubted, but that the change is one of some importance is not questionable

ऋकारर्काररषपूर्वो नकारो णकारं समानपदे ॥ ६ ॥

6 Within the same word, a *n* preceded by *r*, *r̂*, *r*, or *sh*, becomes *n*

---

5 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah varnânâm samhitâ vakshyata*[1] *ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam* [2]*atha vâ* [2] *athaçabdah*[3] *padasamhitânishedhakah*[4]

[1] O *ucyata* (2) G M om [3] B *çabdah* [4] B *tâyâm nish*

6 *samânapada ekapada rkârarkârarephashakârapûrvo*[1] *nakâro nakâram*[2] *âpadyate*[3] *tribhir*---- *tvaṅ*---- *esha*---- *krshno*---- [4]*evampûrva iti kim devânâm*----[4] *samânapada iti kim* · *ebhir*---- *samânam ca tat padam ca samânapadam tasmin*

O has a *lacuna*, beginning with *-napade* at the end of the rule, and ending with *tribhir r-* in the first example [1] G M *r̂rkarareph* [2] G M *natvam* [3] B G M *âpnoti* (4) O om

Already, in a previous chapter (vii 1–12,15,16), we have had detailed all the cases in which a *n* is changed to *ṇ* in the course of the combination of words into phrases, in the conversion of *pada* into *saṁhitâ*, now, the treatise sets out to account for every single *ṇ* occurring in the whole text And the present is the leading general rule, involving, with the extensions and restrictions imposed later, by far the greater number of cases

The commentator's examples are *tribhir rṇavâ jâyate* (vi 3 10[5] O has a *lacuna*, involving the beginning of this citation), *tvaṅ hotṝṇâm* (iv 3 13[4]), *esha vâ rco varṇah* (vi 1 3[1] but W has instead *esha vâ ahno varṇah*, vi 1 3[1 2]), and *krshṇo 'si* (i 1 11[1]), his counter-examples are *devânâm vâ antaṁ jagmushâm* (vii 5 8[1] but G M have only *devânâm*, which of course is found in various places, and O omits altogether), where none of the lingual letters specified comes before a *n*, and *ebhir no arkâih* (iv 4 4[7] O omits *arkâih*), where the *r* is in another word than the *n* All these are cases in which the alterant letter immediately precedes the altered

व्यवेतो ऽपि ॥ ७ ॥

7 Even though other sounds are interposed

Rule 15, below, puts a restriction upon this, pointing out what letters may not intervene between the affecting and the affected letter The examples are *aparaçuvrkṇaṁ dahati* (v 1 10[1] W B omit *dahati*, O inserts *ha* between the other two words), *âtmann evâ 'ramaṇaṁ kurute* (vi 5 11[4] only O has the first two words, and it omits the last), *adhishavaṇam* (i 1 5[2] but G M O have *adhishavaṇe*, iv 7 8 or vi 2 11[4]), and *krshamâṇah pratishṭhâkâmah* (iii 4 3[3])

हिरण्मयम् ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also in *hiraṇmayam*

The only passage in which the word occurs is quoted by the commentator *hiraṇmayaṁ dâma dakshiṇâ* (ii 4 13 O omits *dakshiṇâ*) The intent of the rule is to establish in advance a counter-exception to the exception "not when followed by a mute," made in rule 15, below

---

7 *uktanimittapûrvo nakâro 'nyena* [1] [2]*vyaveto 'pi*[2] [3]*vyavahito 'pi*[3] *ṇatvam âpnoti yathâ*[4] *ap-* - - - - *âtmann*- - - - *adhi*- - - - *krsh*- - - -

[1] G M ins *varṇena* [2] W O om [3] G M om [4] in O only

8 *hiraṇmayam ity asmin grahaṇe nakâro* [1]*ṇatvam âpnoti*[1] *yathâ*[2] *hiraṇ*- - - - *sparçapara* (xiii 15) *iti*[3] *vakshyamâṇa-pratishedhasya*[4] *pratiprasavârtham idaṁ sûtram*

[1] G M *ṇakâram âpadyate* [2] in B only [3] O om [4] O *-ṇasya pr-*

पाणिगणपुण्यकण्वकाणगाणबाणवेणुगुणमणिप्रवादेषु पूर्वः ॥ ९ ॥

9 Also, in the inflectional and derivative forms of *pâni*, *gana*, *punya*, *kanva*, *kâna*, *gâna*, *bâna*, *venu*, *guna*, and *mani*, the first nasal is *n*

The word *pravâda* is not found elsewhere in our treatise or its commentary From the latter's explanation and use of it we derive for it a meaning somewhat different from that which, according to Regnier (note to Rik Pr ii 39), it bears in the Rik Prâtiçakhya The latter makes it mean 'theme,' in our comment, on the other hand, it evidently signifies a derived form of a theme, in any gender or case, in composition, or in extension by secondary suffix, and I have translated it accordingly So far as I can see, however, the same signification belongs to it in most of the passages of the Rik Pr also, and Regnier's exposition of its use calls for revision

There is an abrupt change of implication here, without any intimation of it in the terms of the precept itself, it is only at the end of rule 14, below, that we find the word *prâkrtâh*, which we must understand as applying to rules 9–14—a kind of footing instead of heading (*adhikâra*) see another like case in the third chapter, rules 2–7 (note on iii 2) In this connected paragraph of rules we have an enumeration of the words in which a *n* is "original," and hence found equally in all the forms of the text

The examples are *supânih svangurih* (iii.1 11[4] iv 1 6[3] O, in this and the two following examples, has only the first word), *vrshapânayo 'çvâh* (iv 6 6[3]), and *hiranyapânim ûtaye* (i 4 25 ii 2 12[2]) the text contains half a dozen other examples of the *pravâdas* of *pâni*,—*ganânâm tvâ ganapatin havâmahe* (ii 3 14[3] O omits the last word), *ganâ me mâ vi trshan* (iii 1 8[2]), *ganena ganam* (v 4 7[7]), and *dûreâmitraç ca ganah* (iv 6 5[6]) the cases,

---

9 *pânî 'tyâdiçabdânâm*[1] *pravâdeshu pûrvah prathamo nakârah prakrtyâi 'va veditavyah prakarshena vâdah*[2] *pravâdah*[3] *linga-vibhaktibhedasamâsataddhitâdibhir*[4] *nirdeça*[5] *ity arthah yathâ*[6] *sup-----* *vrshap-----* *hiran-----* *ganânâm-----* *ganâ* *-----* *ganena-----* *dûre-----* *punyo-----* *sâ-----* *kanvâ* *-----* *tasyâi-----* *akarnayâ-----* *gânap-----* *viçalyo-----* *venui-----* *venunâ-----* *yad-----* *yathâ-----* *maninâ-----* [7]*nanu ganaçabdapravâdatvâd gânagrahanam ayuktam* [8]*mâi 'vam* [8] *ganapravâdatve sati tad bhavet kimtu ganapatiçabda-pravâdo 'yam pûrva iti kim gan-----* *ven-----* *man-----*[7] *ityâdishû 'ttarasya*[9] *natvam mâ bhûd iti*

[1] G M *-âdinâm grahanânâm* [2] W *dâh* [3] W *-vadah*, G M om [4] W om *bheda* [5] W *nirdishtâ* [6] G M om [(7)] G M om [(8)] W *ivam* [9] G M O *ra nakârasya*

compounds, and derivatives of *gana* are found by dozens in the Sanhitâ,—*punyo bhavati vasantam* (i 6 11[4] O omits the last word) and *sâ mâ sarvân punyân* (vii 1 7[1]) *punya* occurs in five other passages, once (iii 3 8[5]) in composition,—*kanvâ abhi pra gâyata* (iv 3 13[7] O ends with *abhi*) there are two other cases of declensional forms,—*tasyâi kâno yâ datah* (ii 5 1[7] O alone has the last word, and it omits the first, G M end with *kânah*) and *akarnayâ 'kânayâ 'çlonayâ* (vi 1 6[7] only W has the last word) there is no other case,—*gânapatyân mayobhûr e 'hi* (iv 1 2[2] O has only the first word, only G M have the last two) I have noted but one other case,—*viçalyo bânavâñ uta* (iv 5 1[4] O omits the first word) we have a declensional case of *bâna* at iv 6 4[5],—*venur vâinavî bhavati* (v 1 1[4] O omits the last word), *venunâ vi mimîte* (v 2 5[2]), and *yad venoh sushiram* (v 1 1[4]) there are a couple more of cases,—*yathâ gune gunam* (vii 2 4[2]) we have elsewhere only *dviguna*, at v 2 5[2,3],—and *maninâ rûpâni* (vii 3 14) elsewhere only *manivâla*, at v 6 13 To explain the limitation *pûrvah*, 'the first nasal,' in the rule, the commentator quotes parts of passages already given—namely *ganânâm tvâ*, *venunâ vi*, and *maninâ rûpâni* (but O omits the second example, and the second word of the third)—in which the *pravâdas* exhibit a second nasal which is dental He raises the objection, moreover, that the mention of *gâna* in the rule is unnecessary, since the word is a *pravâda* of *gana*, but replies that the word (*gânapatya*) aimed at is a *pravâda* of *ganapati*, not of *gana* It is true, now, that *gânapatyât* stands one degree farther removed from *gana* than does, for instance, *ganapatibhyah*, or than would *gânikah* if it occurred in the text, yet we should hardly have expected it on that account to receive a different treatment

पणिपणिंवीयमाणाऽण्योः ॥ १० ॥

10 Also in *pani*, *panim*, *vîyamânah*, and *ânyoh*

The passages are *agne deva panibhir vîyamânah* (i 1 13[2] only G M have the last word), *panim goshu starâmahe* (ii 6 11[2] O omits the last word), *vîyamânah tam ta etam* (i 1 13[2] O has only the first word, G M read *-nas tam* etc, neglecting the pause of division between the two words), and *ânyoh kavikratum* (i 2 6[1]) These words are said to be made a separate rule of because there is no longer any inclusion of *pravâdas* or derived forms

ट्वर्गपरः ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also before a lingual mute

---

10 [1] *panî 'tyâdigrahaneshu*[2] *nakârah prakrtyâ 'va veditavyah apravâdârtho 'yam ârambhah agne.... panim.... vîy-.... ânyoh....*

[1] O prefixes the whole series of words [2] O *-âdishu*, G M *-âdishu gr*.

The examples are *çitikanthâya ca* (iv 5 5[1] but G M have instead *çitikanthâya svâhâ*, which I do not find in the text, not even at vii 3 17, where a number of similar expressions are read) and *kandûyeta pâmanambhâvukâh* (vi 1 3[8] O has the first word only) The combinations *nt* and *ndh* do not occur in the Sanhitâ

चङ्कुणाफणात्स्थूणौह्निणुयाद्धिणोतिकौणेयोऽणिष्ठाउल्बणामुगणाश्रुतिश्चुपुणीकाबाणिजायाणवश्चाट्णास्थाणुंतूणवेवीणायामश्लोणयापणेतवाणीःकल्याणीकुणपंवाणःशतशोणाश्रुतिर्धाणिकाम्णी ॥ १२ ॥

12 Also in *çankuna*, *phanat*, *sthûnâu*, *hinuyât*, *hinoti*, *kâuneyah*, *anishthâh*, *ulbanam*, *uganâ* wherever found, *cupunîkâ*, *bâniyâya*, *anavaç ca*, *âtnârah*, *sthânum*, *tûnave*, *vînâyâm*, *aclonayâ*, *paneta*, *vânîh*, *kalyânî*, *kunapam*, *vânah çata*, *çonâ* wherever found, *dhânikâ*, and *m enî*

The passages aimed at are quoted by the commentator as follows *avabhrtha nicankuna niceruh* (i 4 45[2] all but O omit *niceruh*, which would allow the passage to be found also at vi 6 3[4], O omits *avabhrtha*) *nicankuna* occurs a second time in i 4 45[2], *anvâpanîphanat* (i 7 8[3]), *ayâsthûnâv uditâu* (i 8 12[3]), *bhrâtrvyâya pra hinuyât* (ii 2 6[5] O begins with *pra*), *evâ 'smâi pra hinoti* (ii 2 6[5]), *rajano vâi kâuneyah* (ii 3 8[1]), *ye 'nishthâs tân* (ii 5 5[2]), *yajña ulbanam kriyate* (iii 4 3[7]), and also, by i 53, *anulbanam* (at iii 4 3[6]), *âvyâdhinîr uganâ uta* (iv 1 10[2] the example is wanting in W) and *uganâbhyas trñhatîbhyah* (iv 5 4[1] O omits the last word), *varshayantî cupunîkâ nâmâ 'si* (iv 4 5[1] only W has the first word, and it omits the last), *mantrine bâniyâya kakshânâm pataye* (iv 5 2[2] B G M omit the first word, G

---

11 [1]*tavarge pare*[1] *nakârah*[2] *prakrtyâi 'va veditavyah çiti- ---- kand- --- tavargah paro yasmât sa tathoktah*

(1) B G M *rgaparah*, O *rgaparo va* [2] G M put after *'va*

12 *cankuna ------ eshu nakârah prakrtyâi 'va veditavyah avabh- ---- anv- ---- aya- ---- bhrât- ---- evâ ---- rajano --- ye ---- yajña ---- yatrayatra çrutir uganâgrahanasya*[1] *tatratatra natvam karanîyam* [2]*âvyâ- ----* [2] *ugan- ---- varsh- ---- mantrine ---- priy- ---- ce 'ti kim anavas ---- etam ---- ya ---- yâ ---- açlonayâ ---- pane- ---- indram ---- kalyânî ---- purushak- ---- vânah ---- çate 'ti kim* [3]*rtâv- ----* [3] *çonâ ----* [4]*çrutir iti kim çonâya ----* [4] *ni ---- vanas- ---- makârena kim ubhay- ----*

[1] G M O put before *yatra-* (2) W om (3) O om (4) O om

M the last, W O the last two), *priyamgavaç ca me 'navaç ca me* (iv 7 4² G M omit the first word, O the first three), with a counter example, *anavas te ratham* (i 6 12⁶), to prove the need of *ca* in the citation, *etam vâi para âtnârah* (v 6 5³), *ya sthânum hanti* (vii 3 1¹) we have *yajñasthânu* twice at vi 1 2⁴, *yâ tânave yâ vînâyâm* (vi 1 4¹), *açlonayâ 'saptaçaphayâ krînâti* (vi 1 6⁷ only O has *krînâti*), *panetâ 'goargham* (vi 1 10¹), *indram vânîr anûshata* (i 6 12²), *kalyânî rûpasamrddhâ sâ syât* (vii 1 6⁶ only O has the last two words) *kalyânî* occurs in one or two other passages *purushakunapam açvakunapam gâuh* (vii 2 10² only O has *gâuh*) we have *kunapam* as independent word at vii 2 10², *vânah çatatantur bhavati* (vii 5 9²), with a counter example, to show the necessity of adding *çata* in the rule, *rtâvânaç cayamânâ rnâni* (ii 1 11⁵ only G M have *rnâni*, O omits the example *vânah* is a *pada* in the word as divided, *rta-vânah*), *çonâ dhrshnû nrvâhasâ* (vii 4 20 W B end with *dhrshnû*) and *çonâya svâhâ* (vii 3 18 O omits the example, along with the specification of the point it illustrates), the only examples of *çona* that the text contains, *ni jalgulîti dhânikâ* (vii 4 19³), and *vanaspatînâm enî* (v 5 15 O reads *enya*), with a counter-example, to show that the word only occurs after a *m*, *ubhayata enî syât tad âhuh* (vii 1 6⁵ G M O end with *syât*)

अवग्रहो वृषण्छीर्षण्ब्रह्मन्नक्षण्चर्मण्चर्षण् ॥ १३ ॥

13 As final of the former member of a compound, *n* is found in *vrshan*, *çîrshan*, *brahman*, *akshan*, *carman*, and *carshan*

The term *avagraha*, we are told, is here taken in the sense of *avagrahastha* The same interpretation has been given before (under vi 9), and the whole use of *avagraha* in the treatise verges toward an equivalence with its derivative Only T O change the *ç* of *çîrshan* to *ch* after *n*, but, as this is in accordance with the teaching of the Prâtiçâkhya (v 34), I have adopted it

The examples quoted by the commentator are *vâto apâm vrshanvân* (ii 1 11¹ O omits *vâto*), *çîrshanvân medhyo bhavati* (vii 5 25¹), *brahmanvanto devâ âsan* (vi 4 10¹ W B omit *âsan*), *akshanvate svâhâ* (vii 5 12¹), and *carmanvate svâhâ* (vii 5 12²) we have *vrshan-* also at ii 5 8⁴ iv 1 2¹ vii 5 5¹, *çîrshan-* at vii 5 12¹, and *brahman-* at v 7 8³ and vi 4 10¹ (a second time) As counter-examples, to show that the *n* occurs in these words only before a

---

13 *vrshann ityâdigrahaneshv*[1] *avagraho nakârah prakrtyâi 'va veditavyah vâto.... çîrsh-.... brahm-.... aksh-....* [2]*carm-....*[2] [3]*carshangrahanasya*[4] *çâkhântare* [5]*vijñeyam udâharanam*[5] *mitrasya.... iti kecid udâharanti*[6,3] *tan na sâdhu. anto 'lopâd* (xiii 15) *iti vakshyamânapratishedhapratiprasavârtham uktatvâd eshâm grahanânâm carshanîdhrta ity atra*[7] *nakârasya padântatvâbhâvât athavâ rkârarkâraparashâ*[8] (xiii 6)

pause of division, he gives (the whole subject is omitted in O) *vrshann agne viçvâny arya â* (iv 4 4⁴), *tasmât saptaçîrshan* (v 1 7¹), *brahman viçam vi* (ii 3 3⁵ G M omit *vi*), *akshann amîmadanta* (i 8 5²), and *paçûnâm carman* (vi 1 9²)

This disposes of all the *avagrahas* cited in the rule save *carshan* No such *pada* as *carshan* is to be found in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, nor, so far as has yet come to light, in any other Vedic text, nor does the word seem like one that could anywhere occur One cannot help surmising that its presence in the rule may be by a blunder merely, it being, perhaps, an unintelligent repetition of *carman* But, by whatever hap or mishap it found its way in, it is now an accepted part of the text, and has to be dealt with And the commentator first creeps out of the difficulty through the hole to which he usually betakes himself in a like case, asserting that the passage aimed at is read in another text (*çâkhâ*) He then proceeds to state that "some quote as here referred to the passage *mitrasya carshanîdhrtah çravah* (iii 4 11⁵ and iv 1 6³ O omits *çravah*) this is not good, since the words are quoted in the rule by way of antecedent exception to an exception [to rule 6] which is to be made farther on, by the words 'nor when final, nor by the omission of *a*' (rule 15), and in *carshanîdhrtah* the *n* is not final Or others are of opinion that the words in question are specified for the sake of removing any doubt which might arise as to whether the *n* in them were a product of alteration under rule 6 of this chapter, and, in this aspect, the citation of *mitrasya carshanîdhrtah* is to be approved" The logic of this final conclusion I entirely fail to see for no question can possibly arise as to whether the *n* of *carshanîdhrtah* falls under rule 6, that it does so is palpable and undeniable

As we should expect, considering the way in which the Prâtiçâkhya treats the cases, these words are read with *n* in the *pada*-text also namely *vrshan-vân*, *brahman-vantah*, and so on The same is the case in the *pada* texts of the Rik and the Atharvan (see Ath Pr iv 99)

ऋण्णषण्णष्णम्णाराव्णा चेति प्राकृताः ॥ १४ ॥

14 Also in *rnn*, *shann*, *shn*, *mn*, and *râvn*—these are original

The application of the term *prâkrtâh*, 'original,' in this rule is, as was pointed out above (under rule 9), to all the cases rehearsed in rules 9–14

"*diprâpter atra nakâro vâikrta iti çankânirâkaranârtham etâni grahanânî 'ty anye*[9] *manyante tathâ sati mitrasya carshanîdhrta ity udâharanam ramanîyam* [10]*avagraha*[11] *iti kim vrshann ---- tasmât ---- brahman ---- akshann ---- paçûnâm ---- avagrahastho*[12] *'vagraha iti lakshyate* [10]

[1] W *ne*, G M *dishu gr-* [(2)] O om [(3)] B om [4] W *shanh* [(5)] G M om [6] W *-haranam* [7] G M om [8] G M *rkârâ* [9] B *anena* [(10)] O om [11] W *-hasthâ* [12] G M put next before *lakshyate*

The commentary, after pronouncing the citations of the rule "parts of words, intended to include a number of cases," quotes examples, as follows *svayamâtrnnâm upa* (v 2 8[1], 3 2[1],7[4], 5 4[3] O omits *upa*), *asamtrnne hi hanâ* (vi 2 11[3] O omits *hanâ*), and *svayamâtrnnâ jyotih* (v 7 6[2]) I have noted *rnn* elsewhere only in *anâchrnnam* (v 1 7[4]), *abhishanno yasmât* (ii 4 2[3]), *nishannâya svâhâ* (vii 1 19[1] only G M have this example), and *daçamâsâ nishannâ âsan* (vii 5 1[1],2[1] O omits the first word), *pûshno rañhyâi* (i 3 10[2]), *pûshnâ sayujâ saha* (iv 1 2[2] and v 1 2[4] only G M have *saha*), and *pûshne prapathyâya svâhâ* (vii 3 15 G M O omit *svâhâ*) I have noted further only *pâushna* (i 8 9[2] et al), *aryamne carum nir vapet* (ii 3 4[1] twice,[2] G M O stop at *carum*) I find besides *sutrâmne* (i 8 9[2] et al) and *nrmna* (i 7 13[2]), which last, however, the rule was not specially intended for, finally, *dadhikrâvno akârisham* (i 5 11[4] and vii 4 19[4] O omits *akârisham*) and *â grâvnah* (vi 3 2[3] O omits this example) further cases of *dadhikrâvan* and *grâvan* are met with in the text showing the combination *vn*, I have noted no other words in which it occurs Counter-examples, showing that *vn* follows *râ* only, would have been easy to furnish thus, *râyasposhadâvne*, at i 2 10[1]

Cases of quite various and discordant nature are here thrown together Most unequivocally calling for treatment in the Prâtiçâkhya, in order to determine their reading, are the three passages in which *sanna* is altered to *shanna* after *abhi* and *ni*, since (as quoted by the commentator below) the *pada*-text restores the original form of the word, reading *abhishanna ity abhi-sannah* etc Its *s* is converted to *sh* according to vi 2, but there is no authority excepting here for the change of *nn* to *nn*, chapter vii does not deal with this, because it takes up only those cases in which the alterant cause and the altered nasal are found in different *padas*, and rule 6 of the present chapter does not apply to it because its first *n* is protected (according to xiii 15) by being "followed by a mute," and its second *n* by "having a lingual mute interposed" The case of *trnna* is akin with this, only with the important difference that the alteration of its nasals lies beyond the ken of the Prâtiçâkhya, the *nn* being read in every text The remaining three all fall under rule 6 of this chapter, but they require specification because they are also covered by one of the exceptions in rule 16, for they exhibit, as compared with their

---

14 *atra*[1] *sûtre padâikadeçâ ete*[2] *bahûpâdânârtham uktâh rnnâdishv eshu*[3] *ca*[4] *nakârâh prâkrtâ eva vijñeyâh svay---- asam---- svay---- abhish---- *[5]*nish----*[5] *daça---- pûshno--- pûshnâ---- pûshne---- aryamne---- dadhi---- â----*

prâkrtaçabdo 'yam pânyâdishv eva carshanparyanteshu mukhyah catasrshu samhitâsu natvasadbhâvât[6] *rnne*[7] *'ty âdishu tu*[8] *na mukhyah kimtu prâptyabhâve 'pi*[9] *natvaprâpanârthah tathâ hi rnnâdâu pûrvanakârasya*[10] *sparçaparatvân nishedhah :*

themes (*aryaman*, *-krâvan*, *grâvan*), a "loss of *a*" (*alopa*) compare what is said of this *alopa* below

As regards the application of the term *prâkrta*, 'original,' their discordance is more essential, and, indeed, irreconcilable In *trnna*, to be sure, the cerebral *n*'s are as original as in the words specified by rule 13, since, in all alike, the alteration is an accomplished fact in all the forms of text, although ultimately referable to the cause laid down in rule 6 But the last three cases, although also read alike in all texts, are introduced here as counter exceptions to rule 15, and their *n* is no more original than is that of any other of the words falling under rule 6 And finally, there is no sense whatever in which the lingual nasals of *-shanna* are "original" To call them all original, then, seems even more than a looseness or inaccuracy in the use of that term it is a blunder

The commentator perceives the difficulty, and attempts to remove it by a lengthy passage of special pleading The term *prâkrta*, he says, is *mukhya*, 'of primary value' or 'of full force,' as applied to the words beginning with *pâni* (rule 9) and ending with *carshan* (rule 13), since in them the lingualized nasal is found in all the four *samhitâs*, but in *rnn* and the rest it is not *mukhya*, but is simply intended to authorize the nasalization even in the absence of a rule prescribing it Thus, namely in *rnn* etc (i e in *rnn* and *shann*), the first nasal constitutes an exception (under rule 6) as being followed by a mute (rule 15), the other nasal, as having a *t*-mute between it and the altering cause (rule 15) In *shn* and *mn*, again [why not in *râvn*?], the nasal falls under the exception touching the loss of *a* (rule 15) And if it be objected that the lingualization is assured by the competency of the citation—still [it is answered], the implication is avoided that the occasion of the citation is the originality of the *n* [?] Moreover, the word *ca*, 'also,' in the rule, being used in the sense of subsidiary adjunction (*anvâcaya*), shows the lingualization to be not of primary value, if it were primary, it would be found in all the four kinds of text, but it is not so found, for we read in *pada*-text *abhishanna ity abhi-sannah* and *nishannâye 'ti ni-sannâya* And since, from the words *pûshan* and *aryaman*, which end in *n*, such forms as *pûshno rañhyâi* and *aryamne carum* are read in the *varna*-text, therefore the conversion into *n* (all but O say "non-conversion into *n*") in

---

[11]*itarasyo 'ttamasya*[11] *tavargîyavyavahitatvât*[12] *shnamnagrahanayos tv alopâd iti nishedhah grahanasâmarthyâd eva*[13] *natvam sidhyatî 'ti cet evam svabhâvatvam eva grahanasyâ 'pi*[14] *mûlam iti parihârah kim ca anvâcaye*[15] *vartamânaç cakâro 'py eteshu natvam amukhyam*[16] *iti dyotayati mukhyam*[17] *cet catasrshu samhitâsu vidyeta*[18] *na câ 'tra vidyate tathâ hi abhishanna ity abhi-sannah nishannâye 'ti ni-sannâya ity atra*[19] *padasamhitâyâm pûshann aryamann iti nakârântaçabdayoh pûshno rañhyâi aryamne carum ity âdi siddharâpatvâd*[20] *atra varnasamhitâyâm etatsâhacaryâd ekasûtrasthayor*[21]

varna-text is to be inferred also for *rnn* and *shann* (O says *râvn*) in virtue of association with the others, they being found in the same rule with them, for all who understand the rules of affairs hold that the determination of equivocal classes is made by mention in connection with words unequivocal. Therefore the meaning of *prâkrta* (all but O say *prakrti*) as defined by us is alone acceptable.

By comparison with the explanations given above, it may readily be seen how much of reason there is in all this talk. The commentator raises an obscuring dust about the difficulty, but does not at all remove it. The *mukhyatvam* of the term *prâkrta* as here applied is more easily disproved than its *maurkhatvam*.

न षुम्नो ऽग्निर्युष्मानीतो ऽन्तो ऽल्लोपात्स्पर्शपरो व्यवायेषु शसचटतवर्गीयेषु ॥ १५ ॥

15. But not in *shumna*, *agni*, and *yushmânîta*, nor when final, nor after the omission of an *a*, nor when followed by a mute, nor when *ç*, *s*, or a palatal, lingual, or labial mute intervenes.

It would be rather more in accordance with the ordinary usage of the treatise to make five distinct rules of the five independent and unconnected specifications which are here crowded together into a single precept: in fact, we should be guilty of no great violence if we were to divide it into five, affixing to each its own (independently constructed, as if for an independent rule) portion of the comment. But in that case, at any rate, the first rule should read *na shumno'gniyushmânîtah* (not *'gnir*). It is not unobjectionable as it stands, since we should expect the first and third complete *padas* to be quoted as they stand in the text, and the second, which is only a fragment of a *pada*, to be distinguished as such from a possible *agnih*. As to the first, moreover, there is a difference of reading among the MSS. of the text: only T. W. have *shumno;* B. O. have *sumno,* G. M. have *sushumno,* and, as is seen below, even W. has *sumnah* in the reiteration of the rule by the comment. G. M., it may be added, read *vyavâyishu* for *-yeshu* in the last specification.

---

apy[22] *rnnashannayor*[23] *varnasamhitâyâm natvabhâvo*[24] *mantavyah prasiddhapadasamabhivyâhârenâ*[25] *'prasiddhapadârthasamarthanam*[26] *arthaçâstravidah*[27] *sarve khalu svîkurvate tasmâd asmadukta eva yuktah prâkrtaçabdârthah*[28]

[1] G. M. om.; O. *asmin*. [2] O. om. [3] B. *eteshu*. [4] O. om. [(5)] in G. M. only. [6] G. M. *-sambhavat*. [7] O. *rnn i*. [8] G. M. put after *na*. [9] G. M. O. om. [10] O. *-vana kâra*. [(11)] G. M. O. *uttarasya*. [12] W. B. *savarg-*, G. M. *tavarg-* (?). [13] O. *evâ*. [14] W. om. *api*. [15] G. M. *atra yo*. [16] B. G. M. *mukh*, O. *anumu*. [17] G. M. *-yar*. [18] B. G. M. *vidyate*. [19] O. om. [20] O. om. *rupa*. [21] W. *yo*, B. *trayor*, G. M. *-trasthitayor*. [22] W. om. [23] O. *rnenarâvunanayor*. [24] W. B. G. M. *-tvâbh*, O. *eva natvasadbhâ*. [25] W. G. M. *na* but W. inserts a sign of omission before the following *pr*. [26] B. *dartham*, G. M. *dârthan na bhavati*. [27] B. *sarvaça-*, G. M. *niyamam çâ*. [28] W. B. G. M. *prakrtiç-*.

Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows *sushumnah sûryaraçmih* (iii 4 7[1]), *indrâgnibhyâm tvâ sayujâ* (iv 4 5[1] G M omit *sayujâ*, the *pada*-reading is doubtless *indrâgni-bhyâm*, so that the *r* and *n* are *samânapade*, as required by rule 6), and *yushmânîto abhayam jyotih* (ii 1 11[6] only O has *jyotih*, from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in *pada*-text, though in that of the Rig-Veda [ii 27 11] it is read *yushmâ-nîtah*)

Examples of final *n* not lingualized are *pitṝn havishe attave* (ii 6 12[1]) and *pra mrnîhi çatrûn* (i 2 14[2])

The precept touching the omission of an *a* has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of *vrtrahan*, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely *vrtraghna indrâya tvâ* (i 4 1[1] O omits the example) and *vrtraghna stomâh* (iv 7 15[1])—for the derivative adjective *vâitraghna* (ii 5 2[5] et al) can hardly be aimed at, and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental *n* in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii 6 The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prâtiçâkhyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely *shn*, *mn*, and *râvn*), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned, and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising *samânapade*, 'within the limits of the same *pada*,' while in *vrtra-ghnah* etc the affecting cause is in one *pada* and the nasal to be affected in another The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, 'a lion's look'), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction *samânapade* is not in force *ghnah* etc , namely, are altered forms of *han*, whose

---

15 *shumnah*[1] *agnih*[2] *yushmânîtah eteshu*[3] *nakâro natvam nâ "padyate sush-.... indrâ-.. yushm-.... antah*[4] *padânto nakâro natvam nâ "padyate pitṝn.... pra.... alopâd akâralopât*[5] *paro 'pi nakâro natvam nâ "padyate* [6]*vrtra-...* [6] *vrtra-.... nanv atra nimittanimittinor bhinnapadasthatvâd vishamo drshtântah satyam sinhâvalokananyâyena*[7] *prathamapraçne*[8] *saptamâdhyâye*[9] *çeshodâharanarûpena*[10] *ghatate tatra ca samânapadaniyamo*[11] *nâ 'sti, ghna ity asya hançabdavikrtatvâd*[12] [13]*rashahpûrvo havanî*[13] (vii 11) *'ti prâptih* [14] *sparçaparo nakâraç ca*[15] *natvam nâ "pnoti*[16] *samkr-.... ava....*

nasal, by vii 11, is liable to lingualization But *han*, by the usage of the treatise, signifies 'the syllable or audible complex of sounds *han*,' not 'the theme *han* and its derivatives,' and, as the text contains no example of the combination *ghn*, it would have been easy to exempt *n* from lingualization *ghakârât*, 'after *gh*'

The cited examples of *n* remaining unchanged when followed by a mute are *samkrandano 'nimishah* (iv 6 4[1] O has the first word only), *ava rundhe târpyam* (ii 4 11[6] O omits the last word), and *nakhanir bhinnam* (i 8 9[1])

The commentator then proceeds to enter into a long discussion of more than usual subtilty and obscurity, of which I am by no means confident that I apprehend the meaning The point aimed at, indeed, seems quite clear by xiv 4, the *n* of such a word as *pûrna* is to be doubled, making *pûrnna*, here, then, is a case where the first *n* is "followed by a mute" (*sparçaparah*), and so would seem to have its lingual character forbidden by the present rule The reasonable reply to so hair-splitting and impertinent an objection would appear to be that, a duplication being ordered by the treatise, the product can be nothing but *nn*, since *nn* would be no duplication at all The commentator, however, prefers to get around the difficulty by limiting the word *sparça*, 'mute,' as here used, to one which is not the product of express prescription (?) For in *pûrnâ paçcât* (iii 5 1[1] et al) there is duplication, making *pûrnnâ* (not one of the MSS writes the duplication), the one *n* being prescribed by xiv 4, the other being its occasion or root (*mûla*) With this, O prudently ends, the other MSS go on to explain "express" (? *prasiddha*) by referring to the word *nakha-nir bhinnam*, already quoted above, as, with its like, also exhibiting an instance of occasion of prescription This word, namely, falls under rules xiv 4,5 (becoming thereby *nakhanir bbhinna*), and in rule 5 the term "succeeded by a consonant" (*vyañjanottara*) is used in a different sense from "followed by a consonant" (*vyañjana-para*), the meaning of which will be there explained at full length (as we shall find to our cost, in one of the obscurest discussions of the entire treatise) The appositeness of the whole reference I do not understand

Finally, examples are quoted of the suspension of nasalization by

---

nakha-.... sparço 'trâ[17] *'prasiddhalakshanavishayo*[18] *vivakshyate*[19] *anyathâ*[20] *pûrnâ paçcâd ity âdâu natvam na syât rephât param ca* (xiv 4) *iti hi prasiddham*[21] *lakshanam tanmûlam ca*[22] *pûrnne 'ty atra dvitvam* [23]*prasiddhapadena kim* [24] *nakhanirbhinnam ity âdâv api katham cit*[25] *lakshanamûlatvam sambhavati kim tal lakshanam iti cet dvitîyacaturthayor* (xiv 5) *ity atra sûtroktavyañjanottarayor* [6] (xiv 5) *iti vâco yuktyantaram iti brûmah tasya lakshanam tatrâi 'va sphutîkarishyate*[27] *mahatâ prabandhena*[28] *sparçah paro*[18] *yasmâd asâu sparçaparah* [29] *çasacatatavargîyeshu* [30] *vyavadhâyikeshu*[31]

an intervening *ç* or *s*, or a palatal, lingual, or dental mute namely *raçanâm â datte* (vi 3 6³), *agne rasena tejasâ* (i 4 46² only G M have *tejasâ*), *rocante rocanâ divi* (vii 4 20 O omits *rocante*), *somañ râjânam* (i 7 10¹ et al), *prakrîdinah payodhâh* (iv 3 13⁷), *prtanâ jayâmi* (iii 5 3¹˒²), and *janaprathanâya svâhâ* (iii 2 8¹ only O has *svâhâ*, G M have the false reading *-pradha-*, and O has dropped out a part of the word, giving *jananâya*)

In the note to Âth Pr iii 94, I have pointed out the physical reason why these sounds, by their interposition, prevent the lingualization of the nasal they are, all of them, such as call into action for their utterance the tip of the tongue, throwing it out of adjustment for the lingual contact The tendency which the history of Aryan language in India exhibits toward the conversion of dentals into linguals shows itself most actively in the case of the nasal the tongue, being rolled back into the position of lingual articulation by the utterance of *r*, *r̂*, *r*, or *sh*, hangs suspended there, as it were, and makes the next nasal contact lingual, unless the tendency is satisfied by the intermediate production of such a contact, or frustrated by the transfer elsewhither of the articulating organ

The Prâtiçâkhya's enumeration of the cases of occurrence of the lingual nasal is, so far as I have been able to determine, complete No one of the other treatises undertakes such an enumeration

पृक्तस्वरात्परो लो डं पौष्करसादेः पौष्करसादेः ॥१६॥

16 In the opinion of Pâushkarasâdi, *l* after a mixed vowel becomes *d*

The mention of Pâushkarasâdi (O has everywhere Pauskarasâdi), the commentator says, is out of respect, and not because the rule is not a peremptory one "Mixed vowel" is a term which is not elsewhere employed by the treatise, nor does the latter contain anything that should intimate an explanation of its meaning The comment glosses it by 'the sound *r* ' it appears, then, that *r* is thus styled, from having its vocalic quality ' mixed" with consonantal, namely, with the *r*-sound The other Prâtiçâkhyas (see

---

satsu nakâro natvam nâ "padyate yathâ[32] *raçanâm----* *agne----* *rocante----* *somañ ---* *prakrî-----* *prtanâ ----* *jana-----* *rkârarkârâ* (xiii 5) *"diprâpteh*[33] *pratishedho*[34] *'yam vihitah*

[1] W B O *sumnah*, G M *sushumnah* [2] W O *agni* [3] O *eshu*, G M *eshu grahaneshu* [4] W B *tatah* [5] W B O om [6] O om [7] G M *-kanena* [8] O om [9] G M *yâya* [10] W O *viçesh-* [11] G M O *datvani-* [12] G M *-bdadhiki-* [13] G M *drshtah purvo bhavati* [14] G M ins *sparçaparah* [15] G M om [16] G M *"padyate* [17] B G M *tra* [18] B *viçeshayor* [19] O *vikshyate*, G M *pi vâ yujyate* [20] W B *yatha*, G M *athâ 'pi* [21] O *-ddha*, W *pratisiddha* [22] W *ce 'ti*, O om [23] O om [24] W B O ins *ca* [25] W O *etal* [26] B *sutravy*, G M *sutre vy* [27] G M *spashtik-* [28] W *purvo* [29] G M ins *vyavayishu* [30] B ins *vy avayeshu* [31] G M O om [32] in W only [33] G M *-tih* [34] W O *pratinish-*

note to Ath Pr i 37) directly define it as so composed The *l* liable to the change into *ḍ* is called in the comment *duḥçlishṭa*, 'ill joined,' i e, I presume, 'of difficult articulation' (G M, to be sure, seem to apply this title the first time to the *ḍ* instead of *l*, and only O attaches it the second time clearly to the *l*, the others' readings being corrupt, yet there can hardly arise a doubt as to its true connection), it is, of course, the lingual *ḷ* which forms an acknowledged part of the alphabet of the Rig-Veda (Rik Pr i 11–2, i 52 etc) But no such articulation belongs to the alphabet accepted by this treatise—although, on the strength of the present rule alone, it is crowded into that alphabet by the commentator under rule i 1 Nor does the edition of the Sanhitâ, nor do the MSS, so far as known to me, make any use of a lingual *ḷ* As for the MSS of the Prâtiçâkhya and its comment on this rule, B O write the ordinary *l* throughout, W alternates irregularly between the two, G M and T have the lingual letter only As regards the binding force of the rule, the commentator is right so far as this—that a *ḍ*, not *ḷ*, is read of necessity in the words to which it relates, but that this is, to the makers of the Prâtiçâkhya, the result of alteration of an original *ḷ* there is no reason to believe, the euphonic exchange of the two letters is not less strange to the Tâittirîya text than to the Vâjasaneyi (of the Mâdhyandina *çâkhâ* see Vâj Pr iv 143, viii 45) and Atharvan, and the rule is really *pûjârtham* only, and an intrusion into our treatise of something foreign to its system

The commentator first gives his own explanation and illustration of the precept As example of the operation of the rule, he cites *mṛḍâtî "dṛçe* (i 1 14³), and, as counter-example, to show that the change is made only after a "mixed vowel," he has nothing better to offer than an alleged passage "from another text," *nalam plavam* For, in such words as *îḍitaḥ* (i 1 11¹), *pravoḍhum* (i 1 14³), *iḍâyâḥ* (i 2 5¹), *ayâḍ* (i 4 45²), *heḍaḥ* (i 5 11³), *çrâushaḍ* (i 6 11¹), where the Rig-Veda reads regularly the lingual *ḷ* and its aspirate, the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ maintains the *ḍ*, not less firmly than after *r* This, the commentator goes on to say, is an interpretation (but the term he uses is *pâṭha*, properly 'reading' or 'ver-

---

16 *prkṭasvarâd ṛkârât*[1] *paro*[2] *lakâro duḥçlishṭasaṁjñiko*[3] *ḍakâram âpadyate pâushkarasâder*[4] *mate*[5] *mṛḍâtî* - - - - *prkṭasvarâd iti kim · nalam plavam*[6] *iti*[7] *çâkhântare pâushkarasâder*[8] *grahaṇam pûjârtham* [9]*na tu vikalpârtham*[9] *mûrdhasthânatayâ duḥçlishṭaḷaḍakârayoḥ*[10] *sâdṛçyam*[11] *astî 'ti vyâkaraṇânusârî*[12] *sûtrapâṭho 'yam katham anusâritvam iti cet* [13]*tathâ hi*[13]. *sthâne 'ntaratamaḥ sthâne prâpyamâṇânâm* [14] *antaratama*[15] *âdeço bhavatî 'ti*

sûtrasya[16] *'pâṭhântaram api*[17] *vyâkhyâyate prkṭasvarât paro ḷo ḍam* [18] *pâushkarasâdeḥ*[19] *atra samânapada*[20] *ity asyâ 'nuvartanam vijñeyam pâushkarasâdeḥ çâkhinaḥ* [21] *samânapade prkṭa-*

sion') of the rule founded on the authority of the grammarians, who assert a homogeneousness of the *duhçlishta l* and of the *d*, as being both produced in the lingual position and if the question is raised as to how it is so founded, reference is made to a rule of Pânini (i 1 50), which prescribes that, in case of substitution, the most nearly related letter is to be taken I do not see that this exposition and reference have any pertinence whatever

Then, the commentator adds yet another interpretation, which, he remarks, is also highly esteemed It differs from the one already given only in implying (apparently, from xiii 6) *samâna-pade*, 'within the limits of a single *pada*,' taking, then, a different example, *te no mrdayantu* (iv 4 3[2] et al), with the counter-example *ilâmdam bhavati* (vii 5 9[1])—which, in view of the frequent occurrence in the Sanhitâ of *idâ*, *idâvant*, and their like, is not much to the point—and finally, as further counter-example, to justify the restriction *samânapade*, the phrase *pitrlokan̐ somena* (ii 6 2[1], p *pitr-lokam*), where the *l* does not become *d* after *r* But in this last case is involved an additional difficulty, namely, that in the compound *pitrlokakâmasya* (vi 6 4[1], p *pitrloka-kâmasya*) the *r* and *l* do meet *samânapade*, and yet the *l* maintains itself over this, the commentator hobbles as best he may, with the plea that, prohibition having been made in the case of *pitrloka*, it is extended by association to the further compound

The groundlessness and unintelligence of all this special pleading, resorted to for the purpose of forcing in as an integral part of the Prâtiçâkhya a precept altogether foreign to it, is palpable enough, and one grudges the time and words spent in its exposure

---

svarâd rkârât[2] *paro lakâro dakâram âpadyate yathâ*[23] *te----- prktasvarâd iti kim ilâm----- samânapada iti kim pitril------ sahacâritvâd*[4] *ekasya*[25] *nishiddha*[26] *itarasyâ 'pi pitrlokakâmasye*[27] *'ty asyâ 'pi*[28] *samânapadatve saty api nishedho bhavati idam api pâthântaram bahvâdrtam*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane trayodaço[29] *'dhyâyah*

[1] W B om [2] B om, G M *lo dam* [3] all but B *duçl*, B *-jnako*, O *jño*, G M *jñakam* [4] O everywhere *pauska* [5] W *tena*, B *tam* [6] B *vad* [7] B *iti 'ti* [8] G M O *-di* [9] W om [10] all but B *duçl* W B *shtadalak*, O *lakarada-dak*, G M *tadakar-* [11] O *sadriyasamjño dakarum* [12] W *-sarat*, G M *sara* [13] G M *ucyate* [14] G M ins *varnanam* [15] G M O *mas sadriçatama* [16] W *asya*, O *sutra* [17] B *iti* [18] B ins *iti* [19] O *sâda ity*, G M *ity* only [20] G M *-dasya*, and om *ity asya* [21] G M ins *pakshe* [22] W om [23] O om [24] W B O *-caritatv* [25] O *-smin* [26] B *nishedha* [27] W B *kasye*, G M *lokamasye* [28] G M O om *api* [29] G M O *dvitiye praçne prathamo*

CHAPTER XIV

CONTENTS 1–7, duplication of one of the members of a group of consonants, 8, duplication of *ch*, *kh*, and *bh*, in certain cases 9–11, insertion between a surd spirant and mute, 12–13, aspiration of a surd mute before a spirant, 14–28, exceptions to the rules for duplication, and discordant views of certain authorities respecting them, 29–33, occurrence of the enclitic circumflex

स्वरपूर्वं व्यञ्जनं द्विवर्णं व्यञ्जनपरम् ॥ १ ॥

1 A consonant preceded by a vowel is doubled, if followed by a consonant

The intricate and obscure subject of duplication in consonant-groups is treated at more length in this than in the other Prâtiçâkhyas (compare R Pr vi 1–3, V Pr iv 97–114, A Pr iii 26–32, also Pânini viii 4 46–52), but chiefly on account of the liberal citation here made of the discordant views of various teachers respecting it The doctrines of the treatise itself are mainly in accordance with those of the rest This first and leading principle, that the first consonant of a group is doubled, is stated in equivalent terms by all The principal restrictions to its application are, as stated below, that *r*, *h*, χ, φ (rule 15), and a letter doubled, or a mute followed by another of the same series (rule 23), are exempted from duplication For the details, see the following rules

Of course, in applying the rules for duplication, we have to assume the form of the consonant-groups as determined by the other precepts of the Prâtiçâkhya—treating *visarjanîya*, for example, as is prescribed in the ninth chapter, and making the insertions pointed out in the fifth (v 32,33 etc) And further, to finish the matter, the rules for *yama*, *nâsikya*, and *svarabhakti* (xxi 12–16) must be duly taken into account

In an additional note to the Atharva Prâtiçâkhya, I gave a complete list of the consonant-groups of the Atharva-Sanhitâ, with the forms which they come finally to assume under the laws of combination It has been necessary to prepare a similar one for the Taittirîya-Sanhitâ, in testing the reach and bearing of the rules of the present treatise but the scheme is hardly worth giving in full

---

1 *svarapûrvam vyañjanam*[1] *vyañjanaparam*[2] *dvivarnam âpadyate yathâ*[3] *uru*---- *evampûrva iti kim tat*---- *evampara iti kim uru*---- *vyañjanam iti kim pra*---- *svarah pûrvo yasmât*[4] *tat*[5] *svarapûrvam vyañjanam asmât param iti vyañjanaparam dvayor varnayoh samâhâro dvivarnam*[6]

[1] G M put next before *dvivarnam* [2] O *param* [3] G M om [4] W ins *asâu* [5] B om [6] O adds *svarapûrvam iti kim prajananam padbhyâm*---- *vyanjanaparam iti kim ugandâ uta vyañjana iti kim praugam*

The commentator offers a single example, *uru prathasva*, i e *uru pprathassva* (i 1 8 et al the MSS of the comment only very rarely and irregularly write the groups in their duplicated form, so as to illustrate the rules of the chapter), and adds counter-examples first, to show that the consonant is liable to duplication only after a vowel, *tat pravâte* (vi 4 7[2] hardly a well-chosen example, since, though the *p* of *pra* is this time unchanged, the *t* before it must be doubled, *tatt pr-*, a *pra* after a pause would have answered better), second, that the duplication takes place only before a consonant, *urukrd uru nah* (ii 6 11[3]), third, that only a consonant, not a vowel, in the defined position, is duplicated, *praugam uktham* (iv 4 2[1]) O appends a new set of counter-examples, as if a part of a new exposition, namely *prajananam* (i 5 9[1]), *padbhyâm dve savane* (vi 1 6[4] an ill-chosen example, containing cases of duplication as well as of its omission), and *uganâ uta* (iv 1 10[2])

लवकारपूर्वं स्पर्शश्च पौष्करसादेः ॥ २ ॥

2 Likewise, according to Pâushkarasâdi, a mute preceded by *l* or *v*

The commentator declares that the *ca*, 'likewise,' in this rule brings down from the one preceding the being preceded by a vowel, and duplication The former part of the defined implication is at least otiose, since *l* and *v* never occur in the Sanhitâ before a mute, except as themselves preceded by a vowel *v*, indeed, is found in combination only with the nasal mutes, *n* and *n*, *l*, in the groups *lk*, *lg*, *lp*, *lb*, *lbh*, *lm*, and *lpy* The examples quoted are *kalpân juhoti* (v 4 8[5]) and *vibhûdâvne* (iii 5 8[1],9[2] all save B actually read this time *-dâvnne*, with doubled *n*) According to the interpretation given to the next rule, the worthy Pâushkarasâdi does not regard the duplication of the mute after the semivowel as suspending the duplication of its predecessor also, by rule 1, and he would accordingly read *kallppân* and *-dâvvnne*, and this part of his doctrine is, as we shall see, declared unapproved

Counter-examples are given *kalyânî rûpasamrddhâ* (vii 1 6[6] to be pronounced *kallyânî*, or, by rule 21, *kalyânî*) and *vâyavyam* (i 8 7[1] et al to be made *vâyavvyam*), to show that no other letter than a mute is thus doubled, and *kûçmâñ chakubhih* (v 7 23) and *tasmâd etat* (vi 3 11[6]), instancing other consonants than *l* and *v*, with the following mute not doubled in these words, the sibilant

---

2 *pâushkarasâdei*[1] *mate lakârapûrvo*[2] *vakârapûrvo vâ sparço* [3]*dvivarnam âpadyate*[3] *kalpân- --* *vibh-----* *svarapûrvatvam dvitvam câ 'nvâdiçati cakârah*[4] [5]*sparça*[6] *iti kim* *kaly-* *----* *vây-----* *evampûrva iti kim* *kûç-----* *tasm-----*[5] *lakâraç ca vakâraç ca lavakârâu*[7] *tâu pûrvâu yasmât sa tathoktah*

[1] O *pauskar*, as also in the rule [2] B G M ins *vâ* (3) O *dvitvam apnoti* [4] G M put at beginning of clause (5) O om [6] G M *sparçapara* [7] W O *laka avak-*

is itself doubled (except by Hârîta, rule 18), a first mute of the same series with the nasal is inserted before the latter (rule 9), and between the two mutes a *yama* (xxi 12), so that we have as final result the formidable combinations *çcppm* and *ssppm*

The Rik Pr (vi 2) also requires a double mute after *l*, and the Vâj Pr (iv 99) after any semivowel—which last is equivalent with our rule, since *y* is never followed by a mute

We have a right to be surprised at the introduction of this and the rule next following before rule 4, since the duplication they teach is analogous to that after *r*, and of secondary importance to it

स्पर्श एवैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३ ॥

3 According to some teachers, the mute only

That is to say, in the combinations just treated of, the mute is duplicated, but not the preceding semivowel also, and we are to read *kalppân* and *vibhûdâvnne*

According to the commentator, this rule represents the approved usage in the *çâkhâ* It seems very strange to find such approved usage laid down in the Prâtiçâkhya merely as the *dictum* of certain authorities But a rule (xiv 7) is given below, without any restriction, which plainly implies the validity of the present one

रेफात्परं च ॥ ४ ॥

4 Also a consonant that follows *r*

The *r* itself being, by rule 15, not liable to duplication This is the rule second in importance in the whole system, and is found in all the Prâtiçakhyas and in Pânini The Ath Prat (iii 31), the Vâj Prât (iv 98), and Pânini (viii 4 46) ascribe the same effect to *h* as to *r* and it is strange that our treatise, which is so liberal in its citation of discordant opinions, makes no reference to one so well supported as this After *h* we find in the Sanhitâ only the three nasals specified in rule xxi 14 as requiring the insertion of a *nâsikya*, and the three semivowels *y*, *r*, *v*, *r*, on the other hand, forms numerous groups as first member I have noted twenty-four of two consonants, forty-three of three consonants, and five of four consonants, a few of them are exempted from duplication by rules 16, 20–23 The cited examples are *arcanty arkam arkinah* (i 6 12[3]

3 *ekeshâm* [1] *mate lavakârapûrva*[2] *sparça*[3] *eva dvivarnam*[4] *âpnoti*[5] [6]*anenâ 'vadhinâ anena sûtrântarârambhanena ca pâushkarasâdimate lavakârayoç ca dvitvam astî 'ti gamyate*[6]

idam eva sûtram ishtam na tu pûrvam[7] *pûrvoktâny*[8] *evo 'dâharanâni*

[1] G M O ins *âcâryânâm* [2] B *rvaç ca*, G M put after *eva* [3] G M *çapara*, as also in the rule [4] O *dvitvam* [5] G M O *âpadyate* (6) O om [7] O *sûtram* [8] O *ukt-*

i e *arccanty arkkam arkkinah*), *arkyena vâi* (vii 5 9[1] i e *arkk-yena* wanting in O), and *ûrg vâ udumbarah* (v 1 10[1] et al i e *ûrgg vâi*)

The *ca*, 'also,' of the rule, according to the commentator, implies duplication, and precedence of the *r* by a vowel (bringing down *svarapûrva* from rule 1) The question is raised by an objector whether sequence of the consonant following the *r* by another consonant (in virtue of *vyañjanaparam* in rule 1) is not also implied but such sequence is declared not obligatory, and it is pointed out that later rules (15,16), exempting a consonant *in pausâ*, and a spirant before a vowel, from duplication after *r*, prove that the present rule prescribes duplication also where no consonant follows, and where a vowel follows, since there would be no propriety in denying by a special rule what had not been already enjoined by a general rule In support of his assertion that the *r* must be preceded by a vowel, the commentator cites the word *tryambakam* (i 8 6[2]), in which he says that the *y* must not be doubled and he fortifies his claim by appealing to Pânini's rule (viii 4 46), which expressly restricts duplication after *r* and *h* to cases in which these letters follow a vowel (G M add the remark that in Pânini also no implication of *vyañjanaparam*, 'followed by a consonant,' is found) The Vâj Pr (iv 102) makes an equivalent restriction explicitly The groups are not numerous in the Taittirîya-Sanhitâ in which a *r* that does not stand first is followed by a consonant, and the only consonant so following is *y* the combinations are *jry*, *try*, *ñtry*, *ttry*, *ntry*, *stry*, and *tstry*

This finishes the proper exposition and illustration of the rule, but the commentator suffers himself to be enticed into a lengthy and tedious refutation of a trivial suggestion which some one has been impertinent enough to make There are those, he says, who

---

4 *rephât param* [1] *vyañjanam* [2]*dvivarnam âpadyate*[2] [3] *yathâ*[4] *arc-----* [5]*arky-----* [5] *ûrg----* [6]*svarapûrvadvitvayor âkarshakaç cakârah nanu*[6] *vyañjanaparatvâkarshakah kim na syât ne 'ti brûmah niyamâbhâvât tathâ hi avasâne*[7] (xiv 15) *ûshmâ svarapara* (xiv 16) *ity etannishedhadvayena rephât pararasya*[8] *vyañjanasya*[9] *vyañjanaparatvâbhâve*[10] *svarapûrvatve*[11] *'pi dvitvam astî 'ti niçcîyate*[12] *aprasaktapratishedhânupapatteh*[13] *svarapûrvatvânvâdeçena*[14] *kim tryambakam ity âdâu mâ bhûd iti kim ca* [15]*aco rahâbhyâm dve iti*[15] *pâninîyasûtrenâ 'pi svarapûrvatve saty eva*[16] *dvitvam vidhîyate* [17] *tasyâ*[18] *'yam arthah aca uttarâu yâu rephahakârâu tâbhyâm uttarasya yaro dve bhavata*[19] *iti* [20]

kecid evam ûcuh[21] *svarapûrvâdiçabdavad rephapûrvam iti vâcye*[22] *vâco*[23] *yuktyantaram arthântaram samarthayati*[24] *ahar ----- ity âdâu*[25] *vâikrtarephâd*[26] *uttarasya* [27]*na syâd dvitvam*[27] *iti tad etadadhyayanaviruddhapaddhatim adhyâste*[28] *vayam tu va-*

maintain that the analogy of *svarapûrvam* in rule 1 would require *rephapûrvam*, 'preceded by *r*,' to be employed here (instead of *rephât param*, 'following *r*'), and that the difference of phraseology intimates a difference of meaning—namely, that a consonant coming after a *r* which is the product of euphonic alteration, as in *ahar devânâm âsît* (i 5 9² only W B have *âsît*), is not doubled But this, he replies, enters upon a path which is at variance with the reading of this *çâkhâ*, and he proposes himself to set forth the true ground of the different term employed If *rephapûrva*, namely, were used, the rule would be liable to the suspicion of meaning the direct opposite of its real intent, since *rephapûrvam* admits of being understood as *rephât pûrvam*, 'preceding *r*' And if it be retorted that this false implication is of no account, since the case it would involve is already provided for in the first rule of the chapter, and the present rule would be a mere useless repetition, and that the avoidance of such repetition is of itself enough to refute the implication—then the farther reply is made, that that is not sound doctrine, in view of the principle stated in the verse "non-contact with mud is far preferable to the washing of it off," and the teacher uttered the rule in its form as given, with the intent that not even a particle of suspicion of wrong meaning should find occasion from it

There is no good reason to suppose that the author of the treatise, in saying *rephât param*, intended to do anything more than use a lawful discretion in the selection of his phraseology The ambiguity which the commentator ascribes to the other reading is suffered to pass in numberless other cases The more desirable cleanliness of him who has incurred no need of ablution has been referred to once before (under iv 23), in a case somewhat similar

---

dâmo vâco yuktyantaraprayojanam rephapûrvam ity ukte viruddhavigrahena[29] *sûtram samdigdham syât rephât pûrvam rephapûrvam*[30] *iti bhavatv*[31] *esha*[32] *vigraha iti cet adhyâyâdisûtrenâi 'tad gatam iti*[33] *pâunaruktyam asya sûtrasyâ 'padyate nanu pâunaruktyabhayâd eva viruddhavigraham nivârayâmah*[34] *ne 'yam saralâ vrttih prakshâlanâd dhi*[35]*pankasya dûrâd asparçanam varam iti*[35] *nyâyâd*[36] *atra viruddhaçankâleço 'pi nâ 'vakâçam labhatâm iti vâco yuktyantarena sûtram âcâryah provâca*

[1] G M ins *ca* [(2)] O *dvitvam âpnoti* [3] G M ins *svarapûrvatvadvitvayor âkarshakaç cakârah na tu vyañjanaparatvâkarshakah* [4] in G M only [(5)] O om [(6)] G M *cakâro* only [7] G M *atha na* (xiv 14) *ity uttaranishedhadhikâre avasânavisarjanîyajihvâmulîyopadhmânîyâh* (xiv 15) [8] W O *paraç ca* [9] W B om [10] W B *vena*, O *bhâne*, G M om [11] G M *-raparatve*, O om [12] O *gamyate*, G M *niçcaye katham* [13] G M *ktasya pra* [14] O *-rvânv* [(15)] G M om [16] W O *evam* [17] G M ins *tat katham aco rahâbhyân dve* [18] G M *asy* [19] G M *sta* [20] G M add *tatrâ 'pi vyañjanaparatvaprasaktir na drçyate*. [21] O *âhuh* [22] B om [23] W om, G M *rephât param iti vâco* [24] G M *yati 'ti arthântarasyâ 'dâharanam ucyate* [25] G M *atra* [26] W om *vâikrta* [(27)] G M *vyañjanasya dvitvan na syâd* [28] O *-âsita* [29] W *viruddhâv iti grahanena*, G M O *-hane* [30] W B *purvam*, O corrupt [31] W B *bhavaty*. [32] G M *eshu* [33] G M *tatah* [34] O *-ma iti cet* [(35)] G *panke 'ti*, B om *varam* [36] G M *-yenâ*

द्वितीयचतुर्थयोस्तु व्यञ्जनोत्तरयोः पूर्वः ॥५॥

5 In place, however, of second and fourth mutes, when followed by consonants, is put the preceding mute

That is to say, when an aspirate occurs between a preceding vowel (as the commentator specifies in his paraphrase of the rule) and a following consonant, or in such circumstances that by rule 1 it would be doubled, it receives instead an increment (*âgama*) of the mute next preceding it in its own series, or of its corresponding non-aspirate Examples are *vikhyâya* (i e *vikkhyâya*) *cakshushâ tvam* (iv 1 2[3] only G M have the last two words) and *meghyâ* (i e *megghyâ*) *vidyuto vâcah* (v 2 11[1] only G M have *vâcah*), to which W B add *tat savituh* (i 5 6[4] et al , the *t* is converted to *th* by xiv 12, and to the *th* is then prefixed *t*, making *tatth savituh*) and *sâdhyâ* (i e *sâddhyâ*) *vâi devâh* (vi 3 4[8] et al) To show that only the aspirates are thus treated, is quoted *âdyam* (i e *âddyam*) *asyâ 'nnam* (ii 2 5[6] O omits *annam*), to show that a vowel must precede, *vashat svâhâ* (vii 3 12, by v 33, *t* is inserted between *t* and *s*, and the inserted letter is made *th* by xiv 12, then, by this rule, no farther change of the *th* occurs, and we read *vashattth*, not *vashatttth*, W goes so far on this road as to read *vashath svâhâ*) and *padbhyâm* (i e *paddbhyâm*, not *paddbbhyâm*) *dve savane* (vi 1 6[4])—but G M O substitute for the former another similar case, *vat svayamabhigûrtâya* (iii 2 8[1] seven times i e *vattth sv-*, O writes *vatth sv-*)—, to show that a consonant must follow, *ukhâyâi sadane sve* (iv 1 9[3] et al W B omit *sve*) and *meghâyate svâhâ* (vii 5 11[1]) The word *tu*, 'however,' in the rule, the commentator (with more than his usual success in dealing with this particle) explains as intimating the denial of duplication, enjoined by rule 1 He adds that some give the particle a different interpretation, as

---

5 *dvitîyacaturthayoh*[1] *svarapûrvayor vyañjanottarayoh pûrvâgamo bhavati yathâkramena dvitîyasya prathamaç caturthasya trtîyah yathâ*[2] *vi-\-\-\-\- me-\-\-\-\- *[3]*tat-\-\-\-\- sâ-\-\-\-\-*[3] *dvitîyacaturthayor iti kim âdyam-\-\-\-\- evampûrva*[4] *iti kim vashat-\-\-\-\- pad-\-\-\-\- evamparayor*[5] *iti kim ukh-\-\-\-\- megh-\-\-\-\- prathamasûtrena prasaktam dvitvam nivartayati tuçabdah anye tv anyathâ manyante pûrvâgamasya dvitvam nivartayatî 'ti nâi 'tat sâram savarnasavargîyapara* (xiv 23) *ity uttaranishedhâd*[6] *eva tasya tannivrttih*[7]

atra kecid âhuh vyañjanaparayor iti vâcye[8] *vâco yuktyantaram arthântaram sûcayati*[9] *sâmhitâsâmhitasâdhâranam*[10] *paranimittam*[11] *uktam*[12] *tata*[13] *ihâ 'nyatarastha*[14] *âgamanimittatve prâpte 'sâmhitapadânâm nityatvât tadgrahanam*[15] *eva*[16] *nyâyyam iti krtvâ vâikrtavyañjanaparatve sati nâi 'tad vidhânam bhavati*[17] *yathâ abhy asthâd ity âdi nâ 'yam pakshah adhyayana-*

signifying that the increment-consonant is not itself to be doubled, but justly pronounces this to be inappropriate, as such duplication is forbidden by rule 23 of this chapter

In this and the three following rules is contained, for all the cases which come within the purview of the Prâtiçâkhya, the explicit prohibition of a double aspirate Such double aspirates are, however, sometimes written by the Hindu scribes, both in situations where the authority of the phonetic treatises directly forbids them, and elsewhere Thus, my manuscript of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ has, three times, *dh dh* instead of *d dh* as the result of combination of *t* and *h* (at ii 6 12⁵ iii 4 1⁴ v 3 12²), and the Calcutta edition, so far as printed, gives, unadvisedly, the same Both authorities agree in reading *didhdhi* at iii 1 11⁴ The edition, absurdly enough, gives *adhaththâh* at i 1 13², where my manuscript has *adhatthâh* And I find a few cases of *khkh* and *chch*, which will be noted under rule 8, below

As under the preceding rule, the commentator here also enters into a tedious and useless discussion of a verbal question, namely, why 'followed by consonants' is represented by *vyañjanottarayoh* instead of *vyañjanaparayoh* Some, he says, have maintained that a difference of meaning is intended by the difference of phraseology, that it is desired, namely, to except cases like *abhy asthât* (iv 2 8¹), where the following consonant is the product of euphonic alteration The ground alleged for this claim is not entirely clear to me it seems to be that a specified following cause (one that produces an effect in something that precedes it) is common to the *samhitâ*-text and that which is not *samhitâ*, hence, a cause of increment occurring in either kind of text being in question, a citation of words from outside the *samhitâ* is alone suitable, on account of their constancy—that is, *abhi asthât* not being citable as an example under the rule in its *pada*-form, it must not be so treated in its *samhitâ*-form, as well But the claim is disallowed, as being opposed to the actual reading, and also to the fundamental

---

virodhân mûlasûtravirodhâc[18] *ca tathâ hi mûlasûtre svarapûrvatve vyañjanaparatve*[19] *ca sati vihitam*[20] *dvitvam atra nishpâdyate*[21] *na tu*[22] *tatra vyañjanam viçeshitam tadapavâdakatvâd atrâ*[23] *'pi tadviçesho vaktum ayuktah*[24] *çikshâdiparîkshanâd*[25] *adhyayanânurodhâc ca vâco yuktyantarâbhiprâyo 'smâbhir abhidhîyate*[26] *apavâdyâpavâdakayor*[27] *anayor* [28]*niyamo nâ 'sti kim iti* [28] *svarapûrvatve sati vyañjanaparam eva vyañjanam*[29] *dvitvam*[30] *bhajate* [31] *dvitîyacaturthâu ca*[32] *vyañjanaparâv*[33] *eva pûrvâgamam*[34] *bhajata iti kim tu prâcuryâbhiprâyene 'dam sûtradvayam pravrttam katham niyamâbhâvah anyathâ* [35] *kutracit kâryadvayadarçanât* [36] *attâ- - - - annapata ityâdâu dvitvam pra- - - - - addhi- - - - ityâdâu pûrvâgamah*[37] *tâñ hasta ity atra tu*[38] *prâptâu satyâm api ne 'dam kâryam drçyata iti ca*[39] *niyamâbhâvah çikshâ câi 'vam vakshyati*

rule. For, the intent is to cast out or deny a duplication established by the fundamental rule (xiv 1), where the being preceded by a vowel and followed by a consonant was implied, and there no limitation was laid down for the following consonant; hence, it is improper to lay one down here, where an exception is prescribed.

The commentator then goes on to say that he will set forth the real intent of the difference of phraseology, with due regard to the Çikshâ, and in accordance with the accepted reading of the text. But I am compelled to confess myself incapable of extracting a satisfactory meaning from his exposition and argument. The point of it is an asserted absence of *niyama* in the two rules (1 and 5), as of one suffering and the other prescribing exception. *Niyama*, 'obligatory force,' appears to signify here joint application, and so a mutual or reciprocal influence. When a vowel precedes, he continues, a consonant is doubled only when followed by a consonant, and second and fourth mutes take increment of the mute that stands before them in the alphabet only when followed by a consonant. But the pair of rules in question is constructed with the intent of multiplicity ('diversity' or 'independence?' *prâcurya* is not found elsewhere). How does an absence of *niyama* appear? Why, from the fact that otherwise a twofold effect would in some cases come to light. In *attâ havînshi* (ii 6 12[2]) and in *annapate* (iv 2 3[1] et al.), and so on, there is duplication; in *pracchac chandah* (iv 3 12[3]: G M have instead *acchâvâkah*, the reference for which I have failed to note) and *addhi tvam deva prayatâ* (ii 6 12[5]: G M O omit *prayatâ*), and so on, there is increment of a preceding mute; but in *tân haste* (vi 1 3[7]: W has *tâns te* [iv 1 10[3]], but doubtless by accidental omission of *ha*), even though it falls under the rule, the same effect is not seen: hence, there is

svarât[40] *pûrvasya*[41] *varnasya kvacid dvitvam ca kathyate*[42]
na ca vargadvitîyasya na caturthe kadâ[43] *cana*
vyâkhyâtam ca vacanam etadvidvadbhih
kutracit svarayor madhye dvitvam lakshyânusâratah
pûrvâgamas tathâ tatra jñeyo vai navicakshanâih
44 *evamrûpam aniyamam sûcayitum vyañjanottarayor*[45] *ity antarasvîkârah*[46]
vyañjanam uttaram yâbhyâm tâu[47] *vyañjanottarâu*[48] *tayoh*

1 G M O put next before *purv-*, O adding *tu* 2 in O only (3) G M O om 4 G M O *svarapurvayor* 5 G M *vyañjanottarayor* 6 B *utaratrani-*, G M *uttarasutrani-* 7 G M O *iteh-* O om *tan* 8 B om 9 G M O *ti 'ti*, G M add *tatra* 10 G M *samhitusamh-* 11 G M *param ini*, O *uktani* 12 O om 13 O *tatra* 14 G M *rasya* 15 W O om *tad*, B *gunam* 16 W O *evam*, M exchanges the places of *eva* and *iti* 17 O *ti 'ti* 18 O om *sutra* 19 O *nama trapar* 20 G M *-ta*, O puts after *dvitvam*, and adds *ity* 21 G M *nishidhyate*, O *viçishyate* 22 W B O *nu* 23 W B *tatr* 24 G M *yuktah* 25 W *-dipavaca ksh-*, G M *na* 26 O *abhikshi* 27 W B *apavadap* (28) G M *na 'sti virodha iti* 29 O *paramam* 30 W om 31 O ins *svarapûrvo* 32 B *tu*, O om 33 O *parâv* 34 W *me*, G M *-mau* 35 B G M ins *'pi* 36 G M ins *katham* 37 W B *-mam* 38 O om 39 W om 40 O *ra* 41 W *sarvasya* 42 G M *vakshyate* 43 G M *katham* 44 O ins *ity* 45 O *-janayor* 46 G M O *uttarasv* 47 G M *tad* 48 G M *ram*

absence of *niyama* The examples here furnished, which ought to give us the clue to the commentator's meaning, seem to leave us wholly in the dark, since not one of them falls under either of the rules in question the first, second, and fourth are by rule 23, below, exempt from duplication, the third is a case under rule 8, and the combination *ñh* is (see under rule 15) treated as a simple *h* Next, the Çikshâ is quoted, to the effect that "in some cases, also, duplication of the first consonant of a group after a vowel is prescribed, not, however, of a second mute, nor of a fourth, under any circumstances," and, by those versed in the subject, the statement is explained [in conformity with what follows] "in some cases, there is duplication of a consonant between two vowels, in accordance with rule, so there also is to be understood prefixion of the preceding mute, by those skilled in alphabetic sounds" (in the known Çikshâ, it may be remarked, no such verses as these are to be found) And the final conclusion is, that the different term in *vyañjanottarayoh* is intended to signify an absence of *niyama* of this sort That is to say, perhaps, the real independence of the two rules is intimated by the choice of a different term in expressing the common factor which they contain

रेफपूर्वयोश्च नित्यम् ॥ ६ ॥

6 As also, in all cases, when they follow *r*

This, it is pointed out, has the value of an exception under rule 4 The dual number of *rephapûrvayoh* shows that the pair, "second and fourth mutes," spoken of just above, is intended "Also" (*ca*) implies the increment by prefixion of the next preceding mute And the meaning is, that second and fourth mutes, with the limitations prescribed, as preceded by *r*, take always their respective predecessors as increment Thus, *ûrdhvo* (i e *ûrddhvo*) *bhava* (i 2 14²) and *ardhyavâñ* (i e *arddhy-*) *prânah* (vi 5 2² only G M have *prânah*) *Nityam*, 'in all cases,' implies that the increment is made after *r* when the mute to be increased is followed by a vowel also (not alone when it is *vyañjanottara*, as specified in rule 5) Thus, in *artheta* (i e *artth-*) *sthâ 'pâm* (i 8 11 only B has *apâm*), *mûrkhâm* (i e *mûrkkhâm*) *tajjaghanyâm* (vii 1 6⁴), and *goargham* (i e *goarggham*) *eva* (vi 1 10¹)

लकारपूर्वे च ॥ ७ ॥

---

6 *rephât param ca* (xiv 4) *ity asyâ 'pavâdakam etat*[1] *dvivacanena dvitîyacaturthâu grhyete saviçeshanayo*[2] *rephapûrvayor anayor*[3] *nityam pûrvâgamo bhavati*[4] *âgamânvâdeçakaç cakârah. yathâ*[5] *ûrdh-.... ardhy-.... nityam iti kim svaraparatve 'pi bhavatv*[6] *etad iti arthe.... mûrkhâm.... go-....*

[1] W *avadat* [2] W B *navi*, G M O *-shanâu* [3] O *tayor* [4] O *syât* [5] in G M only [6] G M *-ty*

7 And when *l* precedes

The *ca*, 'and,' here brings down from rule 5 only the fourth mute [the last of the two there mentioned] and the increment The second mute is not also included, because (see note to rule 2) no second mute occurs after *l* in the Sanhita The examples are *pragalbho* (i e *-galbbho*) *'sya jâyate* (ii 5 5³ only G M have *jâyate*) and *namo madhyamâya câ 'pagalbhâya* (i e *-galbbh-*) *ca* (iv 5 6¹)—but, in place of the latter, G M give *apagalbho jâyate* (ii 5 5³ O reads *agagalya* simply, which doubtless means the first word of this)

As was remarked above (under rule 3), the laying down of the present precept without any limitation appears to confirm the commentator's interpretation of rules 2 and 3, as teaching the accepted doctrine of the *çâkhâ* It would, to be sure, be not impossible to understand *lbbh* for *lbh* as required here, without any reference to the other groups—*lk*, *lg* etc —in which the duplication after *l* depends upon the earlier rules, but that seems quite unlikely

उपसर्गपाथएषात्यातिधामपरमभूतपूर्वेषु छखिभुजेषु च ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also the preceding mute is inserted before *ch*, *khi*, and *bhuja*, when these follow either a preposition, *pâtha eshah*, *ati*, *âti*, *dhâma*, *parama*, or *bhûte*

The examples after a preposition (in which situation alone the increment of *khi* and *bhuja* is made) are first given by the commentator they are *â cchrnatti* (v 1 7⁴ the preceding word, *anâcchrnnam*, might well have been included, as an additional instance, my MS has simple *ch* in both cases), *nama âkkhidate ca prakkhidate ca* (iv 5 9² G M omit the first word, G M O the last two), *ayakshmayâ paribbhujâ* (iv 5 1⁴), with *vibhu ca me prabhu ca me* (iv 7 4¹ ² O stops at the first *me*) as counter-example, to show the necessity of saying *bhuja*, instead of *bhu* simply, in the rule, and *yâ ca vicchandâh* (v 2 11¹) Then follow counter-examples first, to show that *kh* is increased only when followed by *i*, *nikhâtam manushyânâm* (vi 3 4⁶) and *datsv adhi khâdati* (vi 2 11⁴ only G M have *datsv*), next, to show that the increment takes place only after a preposition, *sachandâ yâ* (v 2 11¹) The examples after the remaining words, as particularly specified in the rule, are *priyam apy etu pâthah esha cchâgah* (iv 6 8¹ only O has *priyam*), with *rtubhir vâ esha chandobhih* (vii 5 15²), to prove the need of quoting *pâthah* along with *esha* in the rule, *aticchan-*

---

7 *cakâraç caturthâgamayor*[1] *âkarshakah caturthasparçe*[2] *lakâri apûrve sati pûrvâgamo bhavati prag-.... namo.... lakârah pûrvo yasmâd asâu*[3] *lakârapûrvah tasmin*

[1] G M *-gam* [2] G M *the sp* [3] G M O *sa*

dasam upa dadhâti (v 3 8[3]), *savitra âticchandasâya* (vii 5 14), *dhâmacchad iva khalu vâi* (ii 4 10[2] B O omit *vâi*), *paramacchado vare* (iv 6 2[1]), and *yad bhûtecchadâñ sâmâni* (vii 5 9[4])

Further examples of the increment of *ch*, falling under this rule, are *âcchad* and *pracchad* (at iv 3 12[2,3]) and *âcchettâ* (i 1 2[1]) if there are others, I have omitted to note them The usage in the manuscripts, of our commentary and of the Sanhitâ, is quite irregular, varying between *ch* simply, *cch*, and *chch*, without much regard to whether the case is one to which this rule applies or not I have collected the cases in which my manuscript of the Sanhitâ has *chch* they are *dhâmachchad* (ii 4 10[2], but *dhâmachad* in the same division), *prachchach chandah* (iv 3 12[3]), and *âyachchadbhyah* (iv 5 3[2]), and, in the combination of separate words (besides the case just quoted), *âcchach chandah* (iv 3 12[2]), *kakuch chandah* (iii 1 6[3]), and *yach chreshthah* (iii 4 8[1]) In every one of these instances, the Calcutta edition, so far as it yet reaches, reads correctly *cch*

I have found no other cases of the increment of *khi* under the rule, but my manuscript has (without authority) *udakhkhidat* (ii 1 1[4],5[1]), *sam akhkhidat* (vi 6 11[1]), and *akhkhidi âh* (iii 5 8), while (along with the MSS of the comment) it reads *khkh* instead of *kkh* in the example (iv 5 9[2]) cited above The edition reads *kkh* at ii 1 1[4],5[1], remarking at the latter place that its manuscript authorities have *khkh* Of course, the doubled aspirate is to be rejected, here as elsewhere, in obedience to sound phonetic theory as well as to the concordant authority of the Prâtiçâkhyas

अघोषादूष्मणः परः प्रथमो ऽभिनिधान स्पर्शपरा-
त्तस्य सस्थानः ॥ ९ ॥

9 After a surd spirant followed by a mute is inserted a first mute of the same position with the latter, as *abhinidhâna*

The surd spirants are (see i 9,12,13) five, namely χ (*jihvâmûlîya*), *ç*, *sh*, *s*, and φ (*upadhmânîya*) The rule is to be paralleled with those in the Vâj Pr (iv 99,100), which direct that a mute be doubled after a spirant, and after *jihvâmûlîya* and *upadhmânîya* (which in that treatise are not reckoned as spirants), also with

---

8 *upasargapûrveshu pâtha--- -- evampûrveshu ca*[1] *satsu cha khi bhuje 'ty eteshu pûrvâgamo bhavati*[2] *cakâra âgamânvâdeçakah yathâ*[3] *â---- nama---- ayuk---- je 'ti kim vibhu ---- yâ----* [4]*khî 'ti kim nikh---- datsv---- upasarga*[5] *iti kim sa----*[4] *etâny upasargapûrvâni anyâny*[6] *ucyante. priyam---- pâtha iti kim rtubhir---- ati---- savitra ---- dhâma---- parama---- yad----*

[1] G M om [2] O *syât* [3] G M O om [(4)] O om [5] G M *rgapurva* [6] G M O ins *apy*

that in the Rik Pr. (vi.2) which allows, but does not require, duplication of a mute after the spirants (namely *ç*, *sh*, *s*, *ḥ*, *χ*, *φ*, *n̆*). The Ath. Pr. (unless such a precept is lost by the *lacuna* occurring in the treatment of this subject: see note to Ath. Pr. iii. 28) and Pâṇini have nothing similar. Our rule, however, is quite alone so far as the treatment of a nasal after a spirant is concerned, making an insertion of a surd non-aspirate, instead of a nasal: and, as will be seen, the next rule quotes an opinion which would bring the Tâittirîya usage more nearly into accordance with that of the Rik and Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâs; but the commentator pronounces that opinion unapproved.

The examples quoted are as follows: *yaḥ kâmayeta* (i. e. *yaχ kkâm-*: ii.1.2³ et al.); *açmann* (i. e. *açpman*, or, after all rules are applied, *aççppman*) *ûrjam* (iv.6.1¹: O. omits the example and puts here, instead of below, that for *φ*); *grîshme* (i. e. *grîshpme* or *grîshshppme*) *madhyandine* (ii.1.2⁵); *ayasmayaṁ* (i. e. *ayaspmayam* or *ayassppmayam*) *vi çṛtâ bandham* (iv.2.5³: only W. has *bandham*); *yaḥ pâpmanâ* (i. e. *yaφ ppâ-*: ii.3.13²): O. adds to this last *tasmin* (vii.1.5¹ et al.: to be treated like *ayasmayam*, above), and, after *madhyandine*, *prâ 'çnâti* (*prâççtnâti*: I have overlooked this citation in searching out the references). As counter-examples, we have first *çarady aparâhne* (ii.1.2⁵: but O. substitutes *brahmavâdino vadanti*, i.7.1⁴ et al.), to show that the sonant spirant, *h*, does not require a like insertion (the case is one of *nâsikya*, xxi. 14); then *rukmam upa dadhâti* (v.2.7¹ʼ²; the case is one for *yama*, xxi.12), to show that a mute receives the increment only after a spirant; and lastly *ishvâ ca vajreṇa ca* (v.7.3¹), to show that a mute only is increased after a spirant. For the second of these counter-examples, O. substitutes two of the same character, namely *yam apnavânaḥ* (i.5.5¹) and *sa pratnavat* (ii.2.12¹ et al.); for the last, it gives (in a passage which has strayed out of place, and got inserted near the end of the comment to rule 10) *agnaye svâhâ* (i.2.2¹ et al.).

In all these combinations, *χ* and *φ* are exempt from duplication by xiv.15, but the sibilants are doubled, except as some authorities (xiv.17,18) would leave them unchanged.

---

9. *sparçaparâd aghoshâd ûshmaṇaḥ paraḥ*[1] *prathama*[2] *âgamas*[3] *tasya sparçasya sasthânaḥ*[4] *samânasthâno 'bhinidhâno bhavati. abhinidhîyata*[5] *ity abhinidhânaḥ: âropaṇîya ity arthaḥ:* [6]*vedântare tasyâ*[6] *'bhâvâd atrâ "ropaṇîyatvam. yathâ*[7]*: yaḥ----:* [8]*açm----:*[8] *grîsh----: ayasm----: yaḥ----. aghoshâd iti kim: çarady----. ûshmaṇa iti kim:* [9]*rukmam----.*[9] *sparçaparâd iti kim: ishvâ----.*

sûtram idam eve 'shṭam: na tatparadvayam[10].

[1] G. M. om. [2] B. O. *pratham.* [3] G. M. *-mo bhavati.* [4] B. om. [5] W. O. *-dhâyata;* B. *-nîyata.* [(6)] G. M. *vedântarasyâ;* O. *-reṇa tad a.* [7] G. M. O. om. [(8)] O. om. [(9)] O. *yam apnavânaḥ: sa pratnavat,* and om. all that follows (but see various readings to next rule). [10] G. M. *tu par-.*

The commentator illustrates with groups of two consonants only (of which the Sanhitâ presents twenty three that would come under the action of the rule), the question arises, then, whether in groups of three or more consonants (of which there are over fifty)—where the mute is followed by another consonant (as *χkl*, *çny*, *shky*, *stm*, *stry*, *φpr*), or where the spirant stands second (as *rçm*, *kshn*, *rshny*, *tsk*, *tsphy*), or where each is the case (as *tstr*, *tstry*, *ntstr*), or where there are two spirants followed by mutes in the same group (as *χkshn*)—the rule is to be relentlessly applied It can admit of little doubt that the sequence of another consonant would not affect the case, whether a preceding consonant would do so is more doubtful Such resultant groups as *nthsttr*, *tthspphy*, *kkhshttny*, and *χkkhshttn*, have a tolerably frightful appearance, but whether they would stagger the heroic soul of a Hindu *çâkhin*, is another matter

To the inserted mute is applied the name *abhinidhâna*, which the commentator explains by *abhinidhîyate*, 'it is set down against,' giving as its synonym *âropanîya*, (I presume, simply) 'to be inserted,' and adding the remark, "owing to the absence of this in any other Veda, there is here insertibility" (?) He takes no notice of the doctrine of *abhinidhâna* as a peculiar and imperfect utterance of certain letters in certain situations, which plays so formidable a part in the phonetic systems of the Rik and Ath Prâtiçâkhyas (see especially the note to Ath Pr i 43) we, however, bearing that doctrine in mind, may conjecture with plausibility that the word here not merely signifies an insertion, but designates also a peculiar quality of the inserted letter

अघोषे प्लाक्षेः ॥ १० ॥

10 According to Plâkshi, when the following mute is surd

That is to say, not when it is a nasal Plakshi would ratify *χkk*, *χkkh*, *shtt*, *shtth*, and so on, but would make no insertion in *çm*, *shn*, and their like This, as was remarked under the last rule, would correspond more nearly with the teachings of the Rik and Vaj Prâtiçâkhyas The commentator illustrates with *nishkevalyam* (iv 4 2^{2}), *yah kâmayeta* (ii 1 2^{3} et al), *paçcât prâcîm* (v 3 7^{3} B reads *prâcî*, which is found in the same division, W has *prâñcam*, which does not occur in the Sanhitâ after *paçcât*), *nish tapâmi* (i 1 10^{1}), *doshâvastah* (i 2 14^{4} et al), *yah pâpmanâ* (ii 3

---

10 [1] *aghosha eva sparçe*[2] *pare* [3]*saty aghoshâd ûshmanah* [4] *prathamâgamo*[3] *bhavati* [5]*plâksheh pakshah*[5] *yathâ*[6] *nish-....* [6]*yah.... paçc-.... nish.... *[7]*aksh-...*[7] *dosh-... yah .... âsp-....*[8] *aghosha eve 'ti kim kûçmân....*[9]

[1] O ins *plaksheç çakhino mate* [2] W B G M *ça*, O *çe 'pi* [(3)] O *prathamo 'bhinidhâno* [4] G M ins *parah* [(5)] O om [6] G M O om, W puts out of place, before *aksh* [(7)] G M om [(8)] O substitutes *suçcandra...* *sparçaparâd iti kim agn....* *sûtram idam eve 'shtam na tu paradvayam* 95 *aghosha eva sparçapare prathamâ yaç chandasâm naç cid ati syâtram brhaspatisûrapate* [8] O adds *abhinidhânaniyamo nâ 'sti*

13[2]), and *âspâtram juhûr devânâm* (ii 5 9[3] G M have only the first word) All these are examples quite needless to be given, as they are read by Plâkshi precisely as prescribed by the preceding rule Counter-examples, exhibiting his discordant view, are *kûçmâñ chakabhih* (v 7 23 W G M have *kûçmân* only, and B reads *kûshmândân*, which I have not found in the Sanhitâ, although *kûçmânda* occurs in the Tâitt Âranyaka, at ii 7,8) and *akshnayâ vyâghârayati* (v 2 7[5] et al given only by W B, and introduced out of place, between *nish tapâmi* and *doshâvastah*, above)

O follows an independent course in the interpretation and illustration of this rule It calls the insertion an *abhinidhâna* (though adding at the end "there is no obligation of *abhinidhâna*") and, for the examples *yah kâmayeta* to *âspâtram*, it substitutes *suçandra dasma viçpate havyavât* (iv 4 4[6] the MS omits *dasma*), *yaç chandasâm* (the thing nearest to this that I have found in the text is *prajâpatiç chandasâm*, iii 3 7[1]), *naç cid ati* (this I have overlooked in searching out the references), *syâtram* (doubtless meant for *âspâtram*), and *brhaspatisûrapate* (probably *brhaspatisutasya te*, i 4 27)

The present precept was pronounced unapproved in the comment to rule 9

उत्तमपरात्तु प्लाक्षायणस्य ॥ ११ ॥

11 But according to Plâkshâyana, on the contrary, when the following mute is a nasal

This can only mean to teach the precise opposite of the preceding rule, or, that there is no insertion when a surd mute follows the spirant, but only when a nasal follows And it is first so explained by the commentator, who gives as examples *akshnayâ vyâghârayati* (v 2 7[5] et al), *açnâti* (i 6 7[3] et al), and *tîrthe snâti*

---

11 [1]*plâkshâyanasya tu paksha uttamaparâd aghoshâd ûshmanah parah*[1] *prathamâgamo bhavati yathâ*[2] *akshn-.... açnâti tîrthe.... uttamaparâd iti kim nish-....* [3]*yah k-....*[3] [4]*yah p-....*[4] *paçcât tuçabdah plâksheh paksham prakshipati*[5]

kecid evam ûcuh aghoshatvam ûshmanas tuçabdo nivartayatî 'ti[6] *tatrâ 'yam sûtrârthah uttamaparât tu*[7] *ghoshavata*[8] *ûshmanah parah prathamâgamo bhavati ahnâm.... çarady.... brahm-.... ghoshavata*[9] *iti kim açmâ.... grîsh-.... ayas-....*

(1) G M om [2] G M om (3) B om (4) G M om [5] W *apakshiyati*, B *kshîyati* [6] G M om *iti* [7] in W only [8] G M *ghoshad* [9] G M *agh*

O substitutes for the whole comment *aghoshaprakrtam tuçabde nirayati plakshayanasya çâkhino mate aghoshâd ûshmanah uttamasparçaparat sasthanaprathamahgamo bhavati aksh .... gri-... çnati ayas- ..*

(vi 1 1²), and, as counter-examples, *nishkevalyam* (iv 4 2²), *yah kâmayeta* (ii 1 2³ et al B omits), *yah pâpmanâ* (ii 3 13² G M omit), and *paçcât* (v 2 9⁴ et al) Plâkshâyana would read the first class as rule 9 requires, but would leave the mute without increment in the second class

Then a second and wholly different interpretation is set forth as taught by certain authorities namely, that *tu*, 'but,' in the rule, instead of negativing Plâkshi's opinion, reverses the quality of the spirant as prescribed in rule 9, changing it from surd to sonant—that is to say, admitting the increment only after *h* The examples given are *ahnâm ketuh* (ii.4 14¹), *çarady aparâhne* (ii 1 2⁵ only W has *çarady*), and *brahmavâdino vadanti* (i 7 1⁴ et al W B omit *vadanti*), the counter-examples, illustrating omission of the increment after a surd spirant, are *açmâ ca me* (iv 7 5¹), *grîshmo hemantah* (v 7 2⁴), and *ayasmayam vi crta* (iv 2 5³ W B omit *crta*) This, which is in itself forced and inadmissible, would also be equivalent to limiting the insertion to the little class of cases in which a later rule (xxi 14) requires the interposition of a *nâsikya*

In the exposition of this rule, O goes its own peculiar way, and takes no notice of the second interpretation which the other manuscripts report It furnishes no counter-examples, and its examples agree only in part with those already given they are (corrected) *akshnayâ vyâghârayati*, *grîshme madhyandine* (ii 1 2⁵), *açnâti* (or *snâti*), and *ayasmayam vi crta*

The rule was pronounced unapproved by the commentator under rule 9

प्रथम ऊष्मपरो द्वितीयम् ॥ १२ ॥

12 A first mute followed by a spirant is changed into its corresponding aspirate

Literally, becomes a second mute—of course, of its own series The examples given are as follows *visrpo virapçinn* (i e *viraphçin*, or, by xiv 1, *virapphçin*) *udâdâya* (i 1 9³ only O has the first word, and it omits the last, W reads *vâratrivadâya*, which is evidently merely a corruption), *tat shodaçy* (i e *-tth sh*) *abhavat* (vi 6 11¹ only G M have *abhavat*), *pratyañ somah* (i 8 21 i e *pratyañk s-* by v 32, then *pratyañkh s-*), and *tat* (i e *tatth*)

---

12 *ûshmaparah prathama sparçah*¹ *savargîyam dvitîyam âpadyate vis-.... tat.... praty-.... tat....* ²*prathama iti kim* ³*tâh....* ² *ûshmapara iti kim*³ *vâk...* ⁴*arvâg.... ity atra prathamapûrvo hakâraç caturtham tasya sasthânam* (v 38) *iti hakârasya caturthâpattir viçeshavihitatvât tatas trtîyañ svaraghoshavatparas* (viii 3) *trtîyatvam idam eva sûtram ishtam*⁴

*ûshmâ paro yasmâd asâv*⁵ *ûshmaparah*

¹ O *âtmana* ⁽²⁾ O om ⁽³⁾ W B om ⁽⁴⁾ in O only ⁵ G M *sa*

savituh (i 5 6[4] et al) As counter-examples, we have *tâh* (i e *tâs*, ix 2) *sanrohah* (v 3 6[3] omitted by O , dropped out in W B) and *vâk ta â pyâyatâm* (i 3 9[1] only O has the last two words), in which no aspiration takes place

A possible difficulty in the application of this rule is noticed and removed by O alone Such a case as *arvâk hi enam parâih* (vi 3 3[1]) might seem to fall under its action, the spirant *h* following a surd mute But it is pointed out that, in virtue of v 38, *h* becomes a fourth mute by special prescription, and hence that rule viii 3 alone applies to the preceding surd, changing it to a sonant

The place of introduction of this precept and the following—coming in, as they do, right in the midst of the rules respecting duplication, with which they stand in no relation—is quite surprising and objectionable The commentator, however, passes the matter without notice

I have not noted any case in which my manuscript of the Sanhitâ attempts the aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, as here required The manuscripts of the commentary, however, which almost never heed the rules for duplication, even in illustrating those rules themselves, often (as we have repeatedly had occasion to notice) observe this one in their citations, although they yet more often neglect it (thus, in the examples here given, G M O aspirate the mutes, and W B leave them unchanged) Being taught in company with the duplication, as part of the *varna-krama*, it has no claim to be taken account of in the construction of an ordinary Tâittirîya text Respecting the teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas upon the subject, see the note to Ath Pr ii 6

बाडभीकारस्यासस्थानपरः ॥ १३ ॥

13 According to Bâdabhîkâra, when the following spirant is not of the same position with it

Rule ii 44 teaches the accordance of the several (surd) spirants, in their order, with the series of mutes, in point of position—more literally, of place of production

T calls the individual here referred to Bâdavîkâra, and W O have in the rule *vâdabhîkâra*, but in the comment *bâdabh-*, the rest have uniformly *b* as initial letter, which I have therefore adopted, as being decidedly better supported than *v* Weber gives the two forms *vâdabh-* (V Pr p 250) and *vâtabh-* (ib , p 78)

---

13 *bâdabhîkârasya* [1] *mata âtmano*[2] *'sasthânoshmaparah prathamah savargîyam*[3] *dvitîyam âpadyate* [4]*samânam sthânam yasyâ 'sâu sasthânah na sasthâno 'sasthânah sa paro yasmât sa tatho 'ktah yathâ*[5] *vis-* -- *tat*---- [4] *asasthâna iti kim tat*---- [6]

ne 'dam sûtram ishtam

[1] O ins *çâkhino* [2] G M O om (and begin the next word *as*) [3] O om [(4)] O om [5] B om [6] O ins *idarâ(?)sthâno yam sakarah*

The commentary (except in O) is at the pains to repeat a couple of the examples of aspiration already given, namely *visrpo virapçin* (i 1 9^3 W omits *visrpo*) and *tat shodaçî* (vi 6 11^1) and it adds, in illustration of the peculiar view of the quoted authority, *tat savituh* (i 5 6^4 et al), where the dental mute, being followed by the dental sibilant, remains unchanged

This rule is pronounced unapproved

अथ न ॥ १४ ॥

14 Now for exceptions

A heading, introducing the detail of exceptions to the rules as already given, and continuing in force through rule 28

अवसाने रविसर्जनीयजिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयाः ॥ १५ ॥

15 A consonant before a pause is not doubled, nor *r*, *visarjanîya*, *jihvâmûlîya*, or *upadhmânîya*

As example of a consonant before a pause, is given *ûrk* (iv 7 4^1 et al W has instead *so 'rkah* [v 4 3^3], but it is not an illustration of the rule, and is evidently here only a corrupted reading of *ûrk*), of which the *k* would otherwise be doubled by xiv 4 Of course, it is only a final after *r* that would fall under the rules of duplication before a pause The text affords, I believe, no instance of a consonant occurring in this position in *samhitâ*, but such words as *ûrk* and *amârt* (vii 1 1^2 et al) need to have their reading in the other forms of text determined by a rule like this The commentator quotes *ûrk ca* (i e *ûrkk ca*) *me sûnrtâ ca me* (iv 7 4^1 B omits the last two words, G M O the last three), as showing that the *k* is doubled when in *sandhi* with a following letter To illustrate the exemption from duplication of the other letters specified, are given *nâ "rtim â rchati* (ii 2 4^7), *manah ksheme* (v 2 1^7), *yah* (i. e *yaχ*) *kâmayeta* (ii 1 2^3 et al), and *yah* (i e *yaφ*) *pâpmanâ* (ii 3 13^2) According to the approved usage of this *çâkhâ* (see ix 2,3), *visarjanîya* comes within the ken of this rule only when it

---

14 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah* [1] *uktasya dvitvavidher*[2] *yathâsambhavam nishedho 'dhikriyata*[3] *ity* [4]*etad adhikrtam*[4] *veditavyam ita* [5]*uttaram yad vakshyâmah*[5]

[1] G M ins *atha* [2] W G M *dhe*, O *vidh-* [3] W *-krta* [(4)] B G M om [(5)] B *no varnah*

15 *padâvasâne*[1] *vartamâno varno* [2]*repho visarjanîyo jihvâmûlîya upadhmânîyaç*[2] *ce*[3] *'ty ete varnâ dvitvam nâ "padyante*[4] *ûrk rephât param ca* (xiv 4) *iti prâptih avasânavacanam*[5] *virâmâbhiprâyam tasmân na samdhâne nishedhah yathâ*[6] *ûrk ca---- nâ---- man---- yah---- yah---- svarapûrvam* (xiv 1) *ity anenâi 'shâm prâptih*

precedes *ksh*, since elsewhere it can stand only *in pausâ*. *Jihvâmûlîya* occurs (by the conversion of final *ḥ* according to ix 2) in the groups χ*k*, χ*kl*, χ*kr*, χ*ksh*, χ*kshn*, χ*kshm*, and χ*kh*; *upadhmânîya*, in like manner, in φ*p*, φ*py*, φ*pr*, φ*pl*, and φ*ph*. The combinations of *r* have been enumerated above (under rule 4).

The other Prâtiçâkhyas have rules equivalent with this, into the variety of expression of which we do not need to enter.

It is to be accounted as a reprehensible omission on the part of our treatise, that it gives no direction as to the treatment of a group beginning with *anusvâra*. The Vâj. Prât. (iv 107) expressly exempts *anusvâra* from duplication, and, in the Rik Prât., in the fundamental rule (vi 1), *anusvâra* is ruled out of account in the estimation of consonant groups, it being taught that a consonant is doubled after it in the same manner as after a vowel. There is no good reason to doubt that the same is to be understood as the doctrine of the present work, and that it would have *anusvâra*, so far as duplication is concerned, deemed and taken as merely an affection of the vowel to which it is attached. That this is not explicitly stated, stands in connection with the equivocal position of the Tâitt. Prât. in reference to the nature of *anusvâra* (see p. 68): according to the view taken at the beginning of the next chapter (xv 1), rules respecting it are no more required than in the Âth. Prât., where they are equally wanting.

The commentator notices that some would read the rule now under discussion as two, cutting off *avasâne* from the rest, and for the reason that otherwise, as the rule stands, it seems natural to understand that "*r*, *h*, χ, and φ, when standing before a pause," are not doubled, as a similar construction was made in rule 10 of the fifth chapter. But he denies the validity of the objection, since duplication of *r* and the rest before a pause is not in the remotest

---

[7]*avasâna iti* [8]*caturnâm varnânâm*[8] *prthag eva sûtram* [9]*kecid âhuḥ* [7] *ekîkarane*[9] *doshadarçanât asâu*[10] *doshaḥ avasâne vartamânâ rephavisarjanîyâdaya*[11] *ity anvayasampâdanam*[12] *avagraha âçîr dhûḥ suvar* (v 10) *itivad iti cet*[13] *nâi 'sha doshaḥ ravisarjanîyâdînâm*[14] *padâvasâne* [15]*dvitva aprâptir*[16] *dûrotsârite*[17] *'ti ne 'yam atra çankâ 'sti*[18] *avasâneprthakkarane*[19] *saty*[20] *avasâne*[15] *kim vâ bhavatî 'ti sâkânkshatayâ*[21] *vacanam anarthakam*[22] *syât ekîkarane tu ravisarjanîyetivarnasâhacaryâd*[23] *avasâne vartamâno varna iti*[24] *labhyate tasmâd ekîkaranam eva ramanîyam*

[1] W B *yad* (2) W B combine, as in rule [3] O om *ca* [4] G M *dyeran* [5] G M *-âna iti v* [6] O om (7) G M *kecid idam sutram prthag evo "cuh avasana iti ca ravisarjaniyajihvamuliyopadhmaniya iti ca kṛtham prthakkaranam* (8) W *caturvarnaḥ*, B om *varnânâm* (9) W corrupt [10] G M O *ko sau* [11] G M O *ravi*, B *-niya* [12] G M *avayavasambhavanam*, O *asya dvitvam samp* [13] O om [14] O *avasânevyatiriktasthale vis-* (15) B om [16] W *rephapraptih* [17] W *tatsâ-*, O *duratot-* [18] G M *kim cit*, O *kim ca* [19] G M O *prth* [20] W *sti*, G M *nasti* [21] G M *-kshâ tathâ*, O *kshaya* [22] B *arth* [23] W *savis-*, B *vis*, O om *varna* [24] O om

manner suggested by the rules (literally, 'is expelled to a distance'), and consequently cannot be suspected of being taught here If, on the other hand, *avasâne*, 'before a pause,' were set by itself, the inquiry would be "what under the sun is it that happens before a pause?" and the expression would appear meaningless When, however, it is combined with the names of letters that follow, we naturally infer from the association that 'a letter *in pausâ*' is intended Hence, the inclusion of the two precepts in one rule is alone to be approved

This defense of the unity of the rule is evidently of the most trifling and futile character, and the objectors are in the right—not, indeed, as the separation into two rules is absolutely necessary, but as it is decidedly preferable, and more in accordance with the general usage of the treatise elsewhere

ऊष्मा स्वरपरः ॥ १६ ॥

16 Nor a spirant, when followed by a vowel

It is only, of course, after *r* (xiv 4) that a spirant can be liable to duplication before a vowel, so that the combinations to which the rule applies are *rç*, *rsh*, *rs*, and *rh* All the other treatises excepting the Vâj Prat have the same rule (R Pr vi 2, A Pr iii 32, Pan viii 4 49)

The commentator's examples are *darçapûrnamâsâu* (ii 2 5[4] et al), *varshâbhyah* (vii 4 13 I presume, my MS of the Sanhitâ has *varshyâbhyah* twice instead of *varshyâbhyah* and *varshâbhyah* O gives instead *suvarshâm*, iv 4 4[1]), *barsam nahyati* (ii 5 7[1 2]), and *barhishâ* (i 7 4[1] et al G M have instead *barhisho 'ham*, also i 7 4[1]) To illustrate the limitation to a spirant, he gives *ebhir no arkâih* (i e *arkhâih*, iv 4 4[7] O omits), to show that a vowel must follow, *pârçve* (i e *pârççve*, vii 3 10[3]), *varshyâbhyah svâhâ* (i e *varshshy-*, vii 4 13 G M omit *svâhâ*), *barsvebhih* (i e *barssv-*, v 7 11), and *agnir hy asya* (i e *hhy*, v 1 5[5])—but O has a different series, namely *dârçyam yajñam* (iii 2 2[3]), *varshyebhih* (the MS has *varshebhih*, I have not succeeded in finding either word in the Sanhitâ), and *agner hy etat purîsham* (vi 2 8[6])

The combinations in which the spirant after *r* is doubled, being followed by another consonant, are *rçm*, *rçy*, *rçv*, *rsht*, *rshn*, *rshm*, *rshy*, *rsv*, and *rhy* To complete the *sandhi*, either with or without duplication, the rules for insertion of *svarabhakti* (xxi 15,16) have to be further applied

---

16 *svarapara ûshmâ dvitvam nâ "padyate svarah paro yasmâd asâu svaraparah yathâ*[1] *darç-.... varsh-.... barsam.... barh-....* [2]*rephât param ca* (xiv 4) *iti prâptih ûshme 'ti kim ebhir....*[2] *svarapara iti kim* [3]*pârçve varsh- . . barsvebhih agnir.. .*[3]

[1] G M, O om   (2) O om   (3) O *dâ ... varshebhih agner..*

प्रथमपरश्च प्लाक्षिप्लाक्षायणयोः ॥ १७ ॥

17 Or, according to Plâkshi and Plâkshâyana, when followed by a first mute

That is to say, these two *çâkhinâu* would leave a spirant free from duplication before an unaspirated surd mute, contrary to the first rule of the chapter The groups which would be thus affected are *çc* and *çcy*, *çp*, *shk* and *shky* and *shkr*, *sht* and its further combinations (*shty*, *shtr*, *shtv*), *shp*, *sk*, *st* and its further combinations (*stn*, *sty*, *str* and *stry*, *stv*), and *sp* One hardly sees why combinations with a second mute (namely *çch* and *çchy*, *shkh*, *shth* and *shthy*, *sth* and *sthn*, *sph* and *sphy*) should not be subject to the same rule—but then, one must not expect to see the reason of anything whatever, general rule or particular exception, in this doctrine of duplications It may be made a question whether the single case, *rsht*, falling under rule 4 is not also here aimed at, if the pair of kinsmen did not overlook it, it is doubtless included with the rest

The examples (which are lost in W) are *suçcandra dasma* (iv 4 4⁶ O omits *dasma*) and *ashtâu krtvah* (vi 4 5¹), a counter-example, with a last mute after the spirant, is *tasmâd evâm vidushâ* (vi 4 9² O omits *vidushâ*), but O has, with B , omitted to point out that this is a counter-example, and gives further, as such, *ishvâ ca vajrena* (v 7 3¹)

The commentator then goes on to say that although the word *ca*, 'or,' in the rule brings down by implication a spirant pure and simple (without exclusion of any sound belonging to that class), yet the real application is only to *ç*, *sh*, *s*, and *h*, since otherwise the mention of χ and φ in rule 15 would be without meaning, their exception being assured by the present precept The interpretation is doubtless true, but the reason given for it is only acceptable on the supposition that what is here put forward as the view of two individual authorities is in fact the accepted doctrine of the Prâtiçâkhya, in any other case, there is no inconsistency or interference between rules 15 and 17, and the commentator should rather have said that, as the pair of dissidents doubtless accepted

* 17 *plâkshiplâkshâyanayoh pakshe*[1] [2]*prathamapara ûshmâ dvitvam nâ ''padyate cakâra ûshmânam anvâdiçati suçc-.... ashtau....* [3]*prathamapara iti kim* [3] *tasmâd....* [2] *prathamah paro yasmâd asâu prathamaparah* [4]

cakâro 'tra[5] *yady apy*[6] *ûshmamâtrâkarshakas*[7] *tathâ 'pi*[8] *çashasaheshv eva sampratyayah anyathâ*[9] *'vasâne ravisarjanîya* (xiv 15) *iti*[10] *sûtre jihvâmûlîyopadhmânîyayor grahanam vyartham anenâi* [11] *'va nishedhasiddheh*[12]

[1] O *mate* (2) W om [3] B O om [4] O ins *prathamapara iti kim ishvâ ..* [5] G M O om [6] W om [7] G M *ushmâk* [8] W O *hi* [9] G M om [10] W O om [11] O ins *shai* [12] W O *-shedhe s-*

rule 15, it was not necessary to regard the present statement of their views as having any reference to γ and φ That the rule is accepted in the *çâkhâ* represented by the commentator may be inferred also from the fact that (under rule 22) he pronounces the five that follow unapproved, but says nothing of this

ऊष्माघोषो हारीतस्य ॥ १८ ॥

18 According to Hârîta, a surd spirant is not doubled

There is unusual variety and inaccuracy of reading among the different manuscripts of the commentary of this rule, and O goes off upon a course of its own yet the aim of all is the same, and not difficult to discover The word *ûshmâ* (which was present or implied in the two preceding rules, and therefore might naturally enough come down into this by continued implication) is here expressly repeated, for the purpose of breaking connection with what goes before If *aghosha*, 'surd,' only were specified, and *ûshmâ*, 'spirant,' implied, the latter would have to be implied along with the attributes attached to it above, namely "followed by a vowel," or "followed by a first mute," and to such a spirant the further qualification of "surd" would be given, while the meaning intended is that Hârîta would forbid the duplication of a surd spirant altogether, in any situation

O alone gives as first example *dârçyam yajñam* (iii 2 2³), all have *vâiçyo manushyânâm* (vii 1 1⁵), to which W B add *pushyati prajayâ paçubhih* (ii 4 6²) and *vâiçvânarasya rûpam* (v 2 3² et al), which O omits, while G M substitute the single passage *asyâ 'parûpam* (iii 5 7³) As counter-example, showing the limitation to a surd spirant, W B give *tiroahnyâ mâ* (vii 3 13 B omits *mâ*), but G M give instead *mahyam imân* (iii 1 9⁶), and O *sapta jihvâh sapta* (i 5 3²)

---

18 [1] *hârîtasya* [2] *mate* [3]*'ghosha ûshmâ dvitvam nâ*[3] *''padyate* [4]*dârç-....* [4] *vâiçyo...* [5]*pushy-....* *vâiçv-....* [5] *aghosha iti kim* [6]*tiro- ...* *ûshmagrahanam*[7] *pûrvasûtrânapekshârtham*[8] *atra yady apy ûshmagrahanam na kriyata ûshme 'ty etat svaraparatvena* [9] *sambaddham*[10] *tasmâd ihâ 'pi tatsambandhaḥ syâi 'vâ*[11] *'ghoshavattvaviçeshah*[12] [13]*syât atas tannivṛttyartham ûshmagrahanam*[14] *atra krtam atah sarvâvastha ûshmâ 'tra dvitvanishedhabhâk*[15] [6]

[1] O begins *ûshmagrahanam purvâsutranapekshârtham purvasutre svaraparatvena prathamaparatvena ca sambandha iti aghoshagrahanam tasyai 'va viçeshanam syât atas tannivṛtyeshu punar ushmagrahanam hari-* etc [2] O ins *çâkhino* [(3)] O *sarvâvastha eva ushmâ 'ghosho nyo na dvivarnam â.* [(4)] in O only [(5)] O om , G M *asyâ....* [(6)] O simply *sapta ..* [7] W *çûshmayâg* , G M *-mâg-* [8] W B *purvatrân-* [9] G M ins *ca* [10] W *bandham*, B *bandhah* [11] W B *va* [12] W *-vatve vi-*, B *vatve 'ti vi-*, G M *'ghoshatvaviçeshanam* [13] W B ins *na* [14] G M *ûshme 'ti gr-* [15] W *n shedhayât*, B *ni-hedhaya*, and adds, out of place, the first part of the comment to the next rule (to *rephaparo*, excl)

Rules 18–22 are pronounced unapproved under rule 22

रेफपरश्च हकारः ॥ १९ ॥

19 Nor *h*, when followed by *r*

The word *ca* in the rule is declared to continue the implication of "according to Hârîta" This individual having in the former rule limited his denial of duplication to a surd spirant, and so left the sonant spirant *h* (? the MSS say "a surd spirant") liable to be always doubled, it is now taught that *h* with the distinctive mark of a following *r* remains single The example given, alike in all MSS, is *duduhre ahrayah* (i 5 5[1]), counter-examples are *juhve* (i e *juhhve*) *hy agnis tvâ* "*hvayati* (i 1 12 G M end with *agnih*, W B omit altogether, along with the introductory explanation to the next citation), to show that *h* would be doubled by Hârîta before any other letter than *r*, and *çukram* (i e *çukkram*) *te anyat* (iv 1 11[3] O omits), to show that any other letter than *h* would be doubled before *r*

O, though using two of the citations given by the other MSS, has a wholly independent exposition of this rule

टवर्गश्च तवर्गपरः ॥ २० ॥

20 Nor a lingual mute, when followed by a dental

That is to say, in the opinion of Hârîta Thus, in *vashat te vishno* (ii 2 12[4] O has *vishat te vikshane*, but it is doubtless only a corrupt reading) and *vid dravinam* (i 8 13[1] et al), Hârîta would leave the groups *tt* and *ddr* untouched, while the rules of the treatise would require *ttt* and *dddr* The other groups in which he would teach the simpler combination are *ttr*, *dd*, *ddhr*, and *rtt*, and *ts*, *tsv* and *rts* would fall indirectly under the same exception, since, by v 33, *t* (converted to *th* by xiv 12) must be inserted between *t* and *s* *ts*, then, would in Hârîta's hands become *tths*, in those of the regular adherents of this school, *ttths* Counter-examples, of obvious application, are *vâk te* (i e *vâkk te*, i 3 9[1] wanting in B O), *tat te* (i 3 9[1] et al found in W only, and of no

---

19 [1]*pûrvam ûshmâ 'ghosha ity ukte*[1] *'ghoshoshmano nityam dvitve prâpte* [2]*viçishta idânîm*[2] *rephaparo hakâraç*[3] *cakârâkrshta-hârîtamate dvitvam nâ "padyate yathâ*[4] *dud-.... rephapara iti kim* [5]*juhve.... hakâra iti kim*[5] *çukram.... rephah paro yasmâd asâu rephaparah*

(1) G M *a* (2) W *viçeshtâdinam*, B *viçishtaçivadanam*, G M *vinnashti id* [3] W *re* [4] G M om (5) W B om

O substitutes *caçabdo haritasya 'nvadeçakah haritasya çakhino mate rephaparo hakâro dvivarnam âpadyate dud ... rephapara iti kim juhve....*

20 *cakâro*[1] *hârîtânvâdeçakah*[2] [3] *tavargas tavargaparo na dvitvam âpadyate yathâ*[4] [5]*vashat....* [5] *vid....* [6]*tavargah paro*

account, since exempt from duplication by xiv 23), *shatkapâlam nih* (i e *shattk-*, i 8 5[1] wanting in O), and *vid vâi marutah* (i e *vidd vâi*, vi 6 5[3])

लतवर्गौ यवकारपरौ ॥ २१ ॥

21 Nor *l* nor a dental mute, when followed by *y* or *v*

Harîta is this time implied "by vicinage" merely, there being no word in the rule to which his memory can be directly fastened Examples of *l* before *y* and *v* are *kalyânî* (vii 1 6[6]) and *bâilvo yûpo bhavati* (ii 1 8[1] G M omit *bhavati*), of a dental mute in like situation, *kanye 'va tunnâ* (iii 1 11[8]) and *ishe tvâ* (i 1 1 et al) The accepted usage of the school requires *lly*, *llv*, *nny*, *ttv*, while Hârîta would leave the groups as in the ordinary text

Combinations of a dental mute with a following *y* or *v* are quite numerous (I have noted about twenty in the Sanhitâ)

परश्च ॥ २२ ॥

22 Nor the following

This rule completely puzzles the native comment, which has nothing of any value to say about it Two explanations are suggested, evidently on the barest conjecture only, and it would be hard to say which of them is the more senseless In the first place, it is said that *parah*, being singular, implies the sound *v* (as being the one last mentioned in the preceding rule), it, namely, of the two affecting causes (*y* and *v*) specified in rule 21, does not suffer duplication examples are *vibhûdâvne* (iii 5 8 et al) and *â grâvnah* (vi 3 2[3] W B omit *â*), and a counter-example, showing the limitation to *v*, is *kalpân juhoti* (v 4 8[5]) And the intent of the rule is to remove a restriction imposed in rule 3 of this chapter—that is to say, to allow the duplication of *l* before a mute, which is there forbidden In the second place, *parah* is said to be equivalent to *dvitîya*, 'second,' and to signify that, when the

---

yasmâd asâu tavargaparah tavarga[7] *iti kim* [8]*vâk*.... [9]*tat* ....[9] *evampara*[6] *iti kim*[8] [10]*shat*-....[10] *vid*....

[1] O *caçabdo* [2] O *tasyâ 'nv* [3] O ins *hâritasya çâkhino mate* [4] G M O om [5] G M om [6] O *tavargapara* [7] W *-gapara* [8] B om [9] G M om [10] O om

21 *hâritah sâmnidhyâl labhyate tanmate latavargâu na khalu yavakâraparâu dvitvam âpnutah* [1]*yathâ lakârah*[1] *kalyânî bâilvo*.... [2]*tavarge 'pi*[2] *kanye*.... *ishe*.... *yavakârâu*[3] *parâu yâbhyâm tâu tathoktâu*[4]

[1] G M om [2] G M om [3] W B *-ra* [4] G M *yavakâraparâu*

My collation of O gives nothing whatever upon rules 21 and 22 and their comment, and I do not know whether there is a *lacuna* in the MS, or whether the collator has overlooked the passage

duplication has been once performed, it is not done over again, as otherwise the process would go on *ad infinitum* And if it be objected that rule 23 sufficiently forbids this repeated duplication, and that this one would therefore be an unnecessary repetition, the answer is made that that is no fault, since the matter in hand is a division of opinions—that is to say, doubtless, that here Hârîta's view only is concerned, and so there is no necessary connection between the two rules

Fortunately, the commentator is able to add that the present precept, along with its four predecessors, is to be ruled out of account as unapproved, so that what it means is of very little consequence

सवर्णसवर्गीयपरः ॥ २३ ॥

23 A letter followed by one homogeneous with itself, or one of the same mute-series, is not duplicated

By *savarna*, 'of like color or sound,' we are told, is signified identity of form, not merely correspondence as regards place and organ of production The difference is, that the latter description would apply to the spirants, in their relation to the series of mutes (ii 44,45), and it is not the usage of this school to exempt the spirants (except χ and φ, rule 15) from duplication, even before a mute with which they are akin The Ath Pr (iii 30) does so exempt them The epithet *savarna*, then, applies only to an identical letter and to the nasal semivowels into which (by v 26,28) *n* and *m* are converted before *y*, *l*, and *v*

The cited examples of the application of the rule to homogeneous sounds are *atvakkâya* (vii 5 12²), *attâ havînshi* (ii 6 12²), *pippakâ te çaravyâyâi* (v 5 19 only O has the last word), *samyattâh*

---

22 *cakâro hârîtâkarshakah*[1] *para ity ekavacanena*[2] *vakâro*[3] *grhyate pûrvasûtrasthanimittayoh* [4] *so 'pi* [5] *na dvitvam âpadyate yathâ vi---- â---- vakâra iti kim kalpân---- sparça*[6] *evâi 'keshâm âcâryânâm* (xiv 3) *ity* [7]*atrâ 'vadhâraṇanirâkaraṇâyâ 'yam*[7] *ârambhah athavâ*[8] *taddvitve*[9] *krte paro dvitîyaparyâyo*[10] [11]*dvitvavidhir nâ 'sti*[11] *anavasthâprasañgât nanu savarnasavargîyapara* (xiv 23) *iti parasûtrenâ*[12] *'pi punar dvitvanishedhah* [13] [14]*pâunaruktyam mâ bhûd iti*[14] *matabhedân nâi 'sha*[15] *dosha iti brûmah*

hârîtamatâd[16] *ûshmâ 'ghosha* (xiv 18) *ityâdisûtrapañcakam*[17] *anishtam*

[1] G M *-tamatâk-* [2] W *eva v* [3] W *sav-*, and puts after *grhyate* [4] G M ins *parah* [5] G M ins *hârîtamate* [6] G M *-çapara* (7) G M *evandhâ nâyâyâ 'yam* [8] W B *yathâ* [9] G M om *tad* [10] G M *âyena* (11) G M *dhin na prapnoti* [12] W om *para* [13] G M ins *tasmât* (14) W *ktyo mâ bhavati*, G M *-ktyam âvahati* [15] W *va* [16] G M *-mate* [17] G M *ityadi paraç ce 'tyantam sû* O wanting (see above)

(i 5 1[1] et al wanting in W B), *yal lohitam* (ii 1 7[2]), and *tvam vâtâir arunâih* (i 3 14[1] only O has *arunâih*) Those which illustrate absence of duplication of a mute before another of the same series are *añkâu nyañkâu* (i 7 7[2]), *prâñcam upa* (v 2 7[3] O omits *upa*), *kândât-kândât* (iv 2 9[2] et al), *tam te duçcakshâh* (iii 2 10[2]), and *ambha stha* (i 5 6[1] et al) Then the commentator quotes from some unnamed authority a verse prescribing that "when a nasal precedes, a *k* or *g* is inserted before *t* or *dh* respectively," and claims that, in virtue of it, there fall under the rule also such cases as *pâñkto yajñah pâñktâh* (i 5 2[1] et al G M O omit the last word) and *tân brûyâd yuñgdhvam iti* (iii 4 8[2] O omits the first two words) From this we should draw the inference that, in forms like those here quoted, the omission of the non-nasal mute (specially prescribed by the Ath Pr , at ii 20) is the regular and proper reading of the *çâkhâ*, its presence, when found, being regarded as an irregular insertion, or a process forming part of the *varnakrama*—which is just the opposite of the etymologically correct view I have not collected all the passages illustrating the point, but the omission is certainly the prevailing, though not exclusive, reading in my manuscript of the Sanhita, as also in the Calcutta edition That the verse quoted is from some treatise dealing specifically with the Tâittirîya text may be inferred (not too confidently) from its making no mention of *th* as requiring the insertion of *k*, it being the fact that no example of *th* in such a situation is to be found in the Sanhitâ

Finally, as counter-examples, where the two mutes are of different classes, we receive (except in O) *vâñ ma âsan* (v 5 9[2] G M end with *me*), *shan mâsah* (vi 5 3[4]), *vidathâni manmahe* (iv 7 15[3]), and *dâmnâ 'pâu "mbhan* (ii 4 13 W B have *dâmnâ* only) here the combinations are to be made *ñńm*, *nnm*, *nnm*, and *mmn* The illustrations are quite one-sided, both for and against the rule, being only groups containing a nasal

This rule furnishes the most important of all the prescribed

---

23 *savarnaparah savargîyaparaç ca dvitvam nâ "padyate savarnatvam nâma sârûpyam*[1] *ucyate na tulyasthânakaranatâmâtram savargîyah samânavargasambandhî yathâ atvakkâya attâ.... pipp-.... samyattâh*[2] *yal.... tvam .... savarnaparâny evamâdîni savargîyaparâny*[3] *api*[4] *vadâmah añkâu... prâñcam.... kândât-... tam... ambha....*

anunâsikapûrvas[5] *tu kakâro madhya*[6] *âgamah*

gakâraç ca takâre[7] *ca* [8]*dhakâra ca*[8] *yathâkramam*

itivacanâd idam apy udâharanam pâñkto.... tân.... [9]*evampara iti kim vâñ.... shan.... vida-.... dâmnâ ....*[9]

[1] B *-pyatvam* [2] W B om [3] W *savarnap* [4] W *eva* [5] W *anusvârap-* [6] W *-dhyamâ* [7] O *raç* [8] W om , G M *yak* [9] O om

restrictions to the sphere of duplication, as there are somewhat over a hundred consonant groups to which it applies

नानुत्तम उत्तमपरः ॥ २४ ॥

24 Unless, indeed, it be a non-nasal followed by a nasal

This is a precept of counter-exception, contravening in part the exceptions established by the foregoing rule Examples are *yâcñâ* (i 5 7[4] the only example of this combination which the text affords), *yajñe-yajñe* (iii 1 11[2] but O has *yajñena*, vi 5 3[1] et al), *âtnârah* (v 6 5[3] also the sole instance), *sa pratnavat* (ii 2 12[1] et al in O only), and *pâpmânam* (i 4 41 et al) a counter-example is *tam mâ devâh* (iii 3 2[2] wanting in O)

The cases here denied exemption from duplication are those in which, according to xxi 12, *yama* is introduced between the two mutes According to the Vâj Prât (iv 111), *yama* suspends duplication

अथैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ २५ ॥

25 Now for the views of certain teachers

A simple heading for the rules that follow, in force as far as rule 28 inclusive—or, according to the commentator's interpretation of rule 28, through 27 only

लकारो हशवकारपरः ॥ २६ ॥

26 A *l* is not doubled when followed by *h*, *ç*, or *v*

The commentator's examples are *malhâ â 'labhanta* (ii 1 2[4] but B O have *-bheta*, which is found in the same division, and G M read *-bhate*, which is doubtless a corruption of the same), *çatavalço vi roha* (i 3 5 and vi 3 3[3] O omits *vi roha*), and *tato bilvah* (ii 1 8[2] O substitutes *bâilvo yûpah*, ii 1 8[1]), his counter-examples (omitted in O) are *kalmâshî* (v 1 1[4]) and *kalyânî* (vii 1 6[6])

This rule, we are told, determines the usage of the school so far as the combinations *lh* and *lç* are concerned, but not in the case of

---

24 *nakâro 'yam pratiprasavârthah*[1]. [2]*uttamaparo 'nuttamo dvitvam âpadyate yathâ*[3] *yâcñâ yaj-.... âtnârah* [4]*sa....*[4] *pâpmânam* [5]*anuttama uttamapara iti kim tam....*[5] *uttamah paro yasmâd asâv*[2] *uttamaparah savarnasavargîyapara*[6] (xiv 23) *iti pratishedhaprâptâv ayam ârambhah*

[1] O *pravârtha* [(2)] G M om [3] O om [(4)] in O only [(5)] O om , B om *anuttama*, W om *uttama* [6] G M om *para*

25 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah ekeshâm* [1] *mate*[2] *kriyata*[3] *ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah*

[1] G M ins *âcâryânâm* [2] G M *matam*, O *maçcitam* [3] G M O *adhikri-*

lv But O has an inserted passage, so corrupted as to be hardly intelligible, which quotes a verse (easily made such by a little emendation) from some authority unspecified, making a distinction between *lv* as occurring in a circumflexed syllable or otherwise—that is to say, between *bilvàh* and *bâilváh*

All the groups here treated of are quite rare, *lç* occurring, I believe, only in *valça* (vii 3 19) and its compounds, and *lh* only in *malha*, *lv* is sometimes found also as the result of *sandhi* (as at i 5 9[6] ii 5 1[6])

The commentator adds, finally, that the next rule also is not approved

स्पर्शः स्पर्शपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27 Nor a mute that is followed by a mute

This is a view of certain authorities merely, and unapproved The examples are *vâg devî* (i 7 10[2]), *apâm ojmânam* (iv 6 6[6]), *âtnârah* (v 6 5[3]), *sa pratnavat* (ii 2 12[1] et al), and *yam apnavâ-nah* (i 5 5[1]) O has only the first two of them

पदान्तश्च व्यञ्जनपरः प्राकृतः ॥ २८ ॥

28 Nor an original final that is followed by a consonant

The natural meaning of this rule would appear to be simply that, in the opinion of some authorities, a final mute which is not the product of euphonic alteration is exempted from duplication before any initial consonant whatever (not before a mute only, as in the preceding rule) The commentator, however, manages to extract from it a very different value namely, that *n* final is not liable to duplication before a semivowel or spirant (i e *h*), and he regards

---

26 [1] *ekeshâm* [2] *mate haçavakâraparo lakâro*[3] *dvitvam nâ ''padyate malhâ.... çata-.... tato....* [4]*evampara iti kim kalmâshî* [5]*kalyânî*[4] *hakâraç ca çakâraç ca vakâraç ca haçavakârâh te*[6] *pare yasmât sa tathoktah*

atra[7] *haçapare kâryam ishtam*[5] *na tu vakârapare* [8] *nâ 'pi pa-rasûtram*[9] *ishtam*

[1] G M ins *sa* [2] G M O ins *âcaryânam* [3] G M *lavakâro* (4) O om (5) W om [6] O *ete* [7] G M O om [8] O ins *lakarasya haçavakarapara iti sûtre sthitah kim karanam nanu vakâra iti prayojanam asti lakaravakarasya samyoga svarito yadi tadâ samyukta eva syad asamyuktas tadanyathâ iti vacanam asti tasmat ka ranât yadâ lakâravakârapara iti tato bilvah* [9] O *sûtram*

27 *ekeshâm* [1] *mate sparçapara sparço*[2] [3]*dvitvam nâ ''padyate*[3] *vâg.... apâm....* [4]*âtnârah sa.... yam....*[4] *sparçah paro yasmâd asâu sparçaparah*

[1] O ins *âcaryanam* [2] O puts next after *mate* (3) O *na dvitvam âpnoti* (4) O om

this as the accepted doctrine of the school, and as determining the reading in this *gâthâ*. How this strange result is arrived at, we have to follow through his lengthy exposition closely enough to discover.

In the first place, *vyañjanapara*, 'followed by a consonant,' is declared to mean 'followed by any other consonant than a mute,' because otherwise, as we have read 'followed by a mute' in the preceding rule, the treatise would be guilty of a needless repetition so far as sequence by a mute is concerned. To this the natural answer would be that the two rules do not come into collision, since they do not occupy the same ground: the former relates to any mute in any situation, the latter only to an unaltered mute at the end of a word; and if the one is declared to have a single pronunciation before a mute only, the other before any consonant whatever, what objection can possibly be taken? Moreover, we are stating here the views of certain authorities, of whom one set might hold rule 27, and the other rule 28: and even if they partly covered one another, there would be nothing wrong about it. Once more, *sparçapara* is claimed to be implied here merely for the purpose of denying it, the commentator's conclusion being that there *is* duplication of *n* before a mute, though not before a semivowel; and that is certainly a very remarkable kind of *anuvṛtti* which should work thus by contraries. Of the last two considerations, the commentator takes no notice (although he has once appealed to the former of them in a somewhat similar case above, under rule 22): the first he states and replies to. It may be objected, he says, that there is a difference of affecting cause laid down in consequence of the difference of the affected letter, the latter is here qualified as final and as original, and the former as being any consonant whatever. Nevertheless, he claims, there would be meaninglessness of the qualification of the affecting cause,

---

28. *vyañjanapara iti sparçavyatiriktavyañjanapara ity arthah. anyathâ sparçânâm api grahaṇe pûrvasûtre 'pi sparça*[1] *ity uktatvât pâunaruktyam syât. nanu nimittiviçeshân*[2] *nimittaviçesho*[3] *'sti: padântatvam prâkṛtatvam ca nimittino*[4] *viçeshâ*[5] *nimittasya tu sarvavyañjanâtmakatvam*[6] *iti cet: tathâ 'pi sparçabhâge*[7] *nimittaviçeshasya*[8] *vâiyarthyam*[9] *sparçapara ity* [10]*atra sâmânyenâ 'pi*[10] *nimittaviçeshasya*[11] *vigatatvât*[12]. *tasmâd*[13] *antasthâdaya evâ 'tra vyañjanaçabdeno 'cyante.* [14]*cakâro yady api sparçamâtrâkarshakas tathâ 'pi pâriçeshyân*[14] [15]*nakârasyâ 'nukarshanam*[15]. *tathâ hi: antasthâdivyañjanaparatve 'nyasparçânâm*[16] *avikṛtânâm padânte sthitir nâ 'sti: samrâd ity atrâ 'stî 'ti cet: mâi 'vam: na san sâm iti* [17] *râpara* (xiii 4) *ity atra vâiyarthyât*[18] *itiçabdo makârasya dvitvasadbhâvam bodhayatî 'ty*[19] *adhyayanânurodhâd upapâditam. tasmân nâi 'sha nishedhavishayah.* [20]*nâ 'pi brahmanvantah nyan.... ityâdivishayah* [20]. *kutah iha*

so far as mutes were concerned the reason he gives is of course a mere quibble, and the point of it is so fine that I am not confident of seeing it rightly it seems to be, that there is an absence of such qualification in the implied term *sparçapara* At any rate, the comfortable conclusion is, that only the semivowels etc are intended by the term "consonant" as employed in the rule The next step is, to declare that *ca*, 'nor,' although it strictly brings forward 'a mute,' without qualification, yet really amounts, on the principle of exclusion, to an implication of *n* only Namely, thus no other consonant remains unchanged at the end of a word before a semivowel or spirant It may be objected that *m* also does so before *r* (by xiii 4) in such words as *samrâj* but this is of no account, for, if admitted as a reproach to the interpretation now under treatment, it would convict of superfluousness a part of rule xiii 4 namely, the *iti*, which was shown, in accordance with the received reading of the *çâkhâ*, to teach the duplication of the *m* We see now why that atrociously forced and groundless construction of the meaning of rule xiii 4 was made, it was needed to bolster up in advance the forced and groundless construction to be put upon the present precept As the *m*, then, constitutes no ground of exception, so neither do the nasals *n* and *ń* in such cases as *brahmanvantah* (vi 4 10[1]) and *nyań raçmibhih* (ii 4 10[2]) For why? the qualification *prâkrta*, 'original,' in the rule involves [as belonging to the letter to which it is applied] the quality of being alterable, since it would otherwise be meaningless, and there is no case to be found where either *n* or *ń* is altered bfore a semivowel or spirant If, then, the term *prâkrta* is to be allowed its proper force, the implication of any other mute than *n* must be excluded Here is another most arbitrary act of construction—as if *prâkrta* meant necessarily '(an alterable mute) *when* it retains its original form,' instead of simply '(a mute) that retains its original form'

---

prâkrta iti viçeshanam vikrtasadbhâvam[21] *kalpayati* [22]*anyathâ svasya*[23] *vâiyarthyât tac ca vikrtatvam nakârasya*[24] *ńakârasya*[25] *vâ 'ntasthâdiparatve*[26] *sati kvacid api padânte na drçyate tasmât prâkrta iti*[22] *prayogasâphalyâya*[27] *nakârasyâi 'vâ 'nukarshanam yuktam iti pâriçeshyam*

kim ca mâhisheye 'pi nakârasyâi 'vâ 'nukarshanam siddhavatkrtyo[28] *'ktam* [29]*tatre 'yam sûtrayojanâ*[29] *ekeshâm* [30] *mate padântah prâkrto nakâro 'ntasthâdivyañjanaparo*[31] *na dvitvam âpadyate yathâ mitro---- om---- etân---- padânta iti kim anyâ---- anv---- antasthâdipara iti kim tân---- imân---- prâkrta iti kim tân----* [32]*vâish----*[32] *nanu katham atra*[33] *vikrtatvam*

rephâd rvarnât[34] *pûrvaç ca tavargâc*[35] *ca paraç ca nah*[36]
tavargasthâna[37] *ity âhur atatsthâno*[38] *'nya*[39] *ucyate*

iti vacanâd asti sthânabhede[40] *krtam*[41] *vikrtatvam* [42] *iti brûmah.*

The authority of Mâhisheya (see note to the introductory verses, p 7) is further appealed to as making the same restriction of implication His explanation is that, in the view of some teachers, a final unaltered *n* followed by a semivowel or spirant is not doubled Examples are *mitro janân yâtayati* (iii 4 11[5] only G M have *mitro*), *omanvatî te* (ii 6 9[5], p *oman-vatî*), and *etân homân* (i 5 4[4]), in all which we are to understand that the *n* remains single On the other hand, there is duplication in *anyâ* (i e *annyâ*) *yanti* (ii 5 12[2]) and *anv* (i e *annv*) *aha mâsâh* (i 7 13[1]), where the *n* is not final, in *tân* (i e *tânn*) *kalpayati* (v 3 12) and *imân* (i e *imânn*) *bhadrân* (i 6 3[1]), where the *n* is followed by a mute, and also in *tân rakshadhvam* (i 2 7) and *vâishnavân rakshohanah* (i 3 2[2]), where, it is asserted, the *n* does not maintain its original form Since, however, there is no rule in the Prâtiçâkhya for altering a *n* in this last pair of cases, the commentator quotes (from the same authority, we may conjecture, which has been recently twice appealed to, under rules 23 and 26) a prescription to the effect that *n* when preceding a *r* or an *r*-vowel, or when following a lingual (the MSS say, a dental) mute, is uttered in the lingual position thus, he says, in virtue of its change of position, the *n* is phonetically altered Finally, he makes an alleged citation from the Çikshâ (not found in the version known to us), which teaches that a final *n* preceding *r* exhibits a peculiarity, and is liable to duplication Such a modification of the utterance of *n* forms no part of the phonetic system of any of the Prâtiçâkhyas

Thus is brought to an end the tedious subject of duplication, the physical foundation of which is of the obscurest, although the pains with which the Hindu *çâkhinah* have elaborated it, and the earnestness with which they assert their discordant views respecting it, prove that it had for them a real, or what seemed like a real, value

---

çikshâ câi 'vam vakshyati

[43]*rephât pûrvo*[43] *nakâro yah padânte*[44] *yatra*[45] *drçyate*

viçesham tatra jânîyâd dvitvam ity[46] *abhidhîyate*

[47] *vyañjanam asmât* [48]*param iti*[48] *vyañjanaparah prakrtih*[49] *svabhâvah tatsambandhî prâkrtah*

[1] O *çapara* [2] G M *ttavâçan*, O *-ttanimittav* [3] G M *viçishto 'py artho*, O *naimittikaviçesho 'py a* [4] G M *tto* [5] G M O *shah* [6] G M *-kam* [7] G M *-çavibh-* [8] G M *çishte 'sya* [9] O *rthye* [(10)] O *avyañjanasâmanye*, G M om *api* [11] G M *sya*, O *-sha* [12] G M *'pi g*, O *pag-* [13] O om [(14)] W B *cakara sparçaksharapari-*, G M *cakarasthanisparçakarshakah pariçeshyan* [(15)] B *takarakarshanam* [16] G M O *saty any* [17] G M ins *tu* [18] G M om [19] W om *iti* [(20)] W om [21] W *-ave* [22] G M om [23] B *svarasya* [24] W B *nak* [25] W *dak-*, B om [26] O *divyañjanap* [27] W *sakal* [28] O *ddhev* [(29)] O om, B G M *tatrâi 'vam s-*, G M *tre yo* [30] O ins *acaryânam* [31] W *sthavy* [(32)] O om [33] W *a* [34] W O *av*, B *v-*, G M *rav-* [35] all the MSS *tav* [36] G M *na* [37] W B O *tav* [38] W O *ata sth-*, G M *asthane* [39] G M om [40] O *da*, G M *-dât* [41] G M om [42] O ins *asti* [(43)] all but O *rephap* [44] W G *to* [45] G M *yadi* [46] B om [47] O ins *cakaro kanasyarçakarshakah* [(48)] W *paro* [49] G M O *tir iti*

उदात्तात्परो ऽनुदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ २९ ॥

29 A grave following an acute becomes circumflex

The following rule shows that the substantive here to be understood is *svarah*, 'vowel' All the other Prâtiçâkhyas, in their corresponding rules (R Pr iii 9, V Pr iv 134, A Pr iii 67), state the principle as applying to an *aksharam*, 'syllable' In his explanation and illustration, however, the commentator is not careful to bear this in mind He states the sphere of the rule to be all the three kinds of enclitic circumflex, the *prâtihata* (xx 3), *pâdavrtta* (xx 6), and *tâirovyañjana* (xx 7), although these in part include cases to which only the next rule attributes the circumflexed quality And his examples are *sá idhânáh* (iv 4 4[5]), *áthâ 'bravît* (iii 2 11[3]), *vásvy asi* (i 2 5[1] et al), *práugam* (iv 4 2[1]), and *táyâ devátayâ* (iv 2 9[2] et al), of which only the first and fourth show the circumflex vowel following the acute without an intervening consonant (rule 30) Nor are all the examples unexceptionable in other respects for though the *i* of *idhânáh* and the *a* of *asi* are really *anudâtta*, 'grave,' in the *pada*-text, and so show an actual conversion into circumflex, the other exhibited cases of enclitic circumflex are circumflexed in the *pada*-text as well, and undergo no alteration in consequence of their change to *samhitâ* It is at this that the commentator aims, when he adds that, "there being grave quality in the condition of separation of letters, then, when these are combined together, circumflex quality appears in accordance with the present precept" That is to say, it is the natural unaccented quality of the syllable that is here implied in *anudâtta*, not its being technically grave, and marked as such This understanding is also needed in order to make good rule 31, where we are not taught that the enclitically circumflexed final of *átha*, for example, becomes grave before an acute or circumflex (as in *átha tvâm*, *átha kvà*), but that the unaccented final *a*, which was made circumflex by rules 29 and 30 after *á*, is exempted from the change when so followed, and remains unaccented

The enclitic circumflex is written in the recorded Tâittirîya text in the same manner as in the Rik and Atharvan, namely, by the perpendicular stroke above the syllable, the same that is used for the independent circumflex The method is so familiar to all students of the Veda that it does not need to be illustrated here Certain specialties of Tâittirîya usage will come up for notice under later rules (xix 3, xxi 10,11)

---

29 *prâtihatapâdavrttatâirovyañjanavishayam*[1] *etat* · *udâttât paro 'nudâttah svaritam âpadyate yathâ sa---- athâ---- vasvy--- pra----- tayâ---- varnavibhâgâvasthâyâm anudâttatve saty* [2]*eva punas tatsamhitâyâm*[2] *eva*[3] *tallakshanasvaritatvam*[4] *praugam ityâdâu vijñeyam*

[1] O om *padavrtta*, and ins *prâvrita* before *vish* (2) W *evá 'dhastât sam-*

For an exposition of the place and value of the enclitic circumflex in the Hindu accentual system, see the note to Ath. Pr. iii. 65. It may doubtless admit of question whether the Hindu phonetists, in noting the syllable naturally grave as being otherwise than grave when immediately preceded by an acute, would not have apprehended it better, and described it more truly, as a middle tone between acute and grave, rather than a combination (i. 40) of acute and grave. Arguments drawn from the analogies of the Greek and Latin accentual systems (see F. Misteli, in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, vol. xvii., 1868; also Prof. J. Hadley, in the Proceedings of the Am. Oriental Society for Oct. 1869 [Journal, vol. ix., pp. lxii.–lxiii.]) may press upon us this latter view as the more plausible. But that any one having access to the sources of knowledge upon the subject should dispute the substantial identity in physical character of the Greek circumflex and the Sanskrit independent *svarita*, and should set down the latter as a "middle tone," in the face of all authority and of all sound phonetic theory, savors of inexcusable carelessness or prejudice.

व्यञ्जनान्तर्हितो ऽपि ॥ ३० ॥

30. Even when consonants intervene.

For the necessity of this explicit statement, see the note on the preceding rule. The commentator, having already given under the latter several cases in which the affected and the affecting vowel were separated by one or more consonants, has nothing that is new to offer; but he quotes, nevertheless, *tád agne anrnó bhavâmi* (iii. 3. 8²: B. O. omit *bhavâmi*) and *yás tvâ hrdâ'* (i. 4. 46¹): in the first case, *ag-* and *bha-* are circumflexed; in the second, *tvâ*.

नोदात्तस्वरितपरः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Not, however, when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, the syllable naturally unaccented or grave—but which, coming next after an acute, would usually take, by rule 29, the tone of transition from higher to lower pitch—retains its low or grave tone if immediately followed by an acute, or by a (*nitya* or independent, of course) circumflex, of which the first element is acute: the pitch of voice is governed by the following tone in preference to the preceding, and sinks at once, without perceptible movement of transfer, to the level of *anudâtta*, as a vantage-ground from which to rise to the immediately succeeding high point.

In this rule, as well as that to which it constitutes an exception,

30. *vyañjanântarhito*[1] *'py udâttât paro 'nudâttaḥ svaritam*[2] *âpadyate: yathâ*[3] *tad.... yas....* [4]*ity âdi*[4]*. antarhito vyavahita ity arthaḥ.*

[1] O. *ant-*. [2] B. *tatvam*. [3] G. M. om. (4) O. om.

all authorities are agreed (see note to Ath Pr iii 70), although we should not less naturally expect the double attraction, of a high tone on either hand, to exercise at least as much assimilating effect upon the pitch of an intermediate syllable as a preceding high tone alone exerts

The commentator's examples are *sá imám lokám* (i 5 9[4] but G M add *ajayan*, which doubtless means *tá imám lokám ajayan*, vii 1 5[3]), *tásmât tá âdyâ' annadhâ'nât* (vii 1 1[5] only O has the first word and the last), *kírînâ mányamânah* (i 4 46[1]), and *tásyâi vy'rddham ândám ajâyata* (vi 5 6[1] only G M have the last two words) the vowels between acute and acute, or between acute and circumflex, in these examples, are *anudâtta*, and written, as such, with the horizontal stroke beneath

The three rules here given only apply, in strictness, to a single unaccented syllable following an acute, where there is more than one such, the rules for *pracaya* (xxi 10,11) come into force

नाग्निवेश्यायनस्य ॥ ३२ ॥

32 Not so, according to Âgniveçyâyana

The significance of this rule (which is declared unapproved, in the comment to its successor) is more clearly stated by O, in an independent exposition, than by the other four versions of the comment It is meant to exhibit an opinion contravening the doctrine laid down by its predecessor, and allowing the circumflex accent to stand, even when the following syllable has, or begins with, the high tone No examples are given, except by O, which has *vódhavê* (i 6 2[1] et al) and *tásya kvà suvargáh* (ii 6 5[5])

G M read, in rule and comment, Âgnivâiçyâyana

सर्वा नेत्येके सर्वा नेत्येके ॥ ३३ ॥

33 Some say not, in all cases

---

31 *udâttasvaritapara*[1] *udâttât paro 'nudâtto na*[2] *svaritam âpadyate*[3] *yathâ*[4] *sa---- tas----- kîr ---- tasyâi---- udâttaç ca svaritaç co 'dâttasvaritâu tâu parâu yasmât sa tatho 'ktah*

[1] W *paro nân*, B *svaritaparo va*, G M *udâttapara svaritaparo vâ*, O do, except *va* [2] G M O put after *svaritam* [3] B *âpnoti*, O *prâpnoti* [4] G M om

32 *pûrvasûtrapratiprasavârtho*[1] *'yam nakârah udâttât paro 'nudâttah svaritam*[2] *âgniveçyâyanasya*[3] *mata udâttaparo*[4] *vâ*[5] *svaritaparo vâ*[6] *nâ ''padyata iti na*[7] *pûrvoktâny evo 'dâharanâni*

[1] B *-trasya prati-* [2] G M om [3] G M *yana* [4] W B G M *ttât pa* [5] B *'nudâtta*, G M om [6] B G M ins *svaritam* [7] B om

O substitutes *agniveçyâyanasya çâkhino mate udattarapara svaritaparo vâ udâttât paro 'nudatta svaritam âpadyate na pratishedhah yathâ vo---- tas---*

According to the majority of MSS of the comment, the denial of these skeptical people is not limited to the enclitic *svarita*, but extends to the whole accent, in all its seven forms (xx 1–8) Thus, namely, in the *brâhmana* of the Vâjasaneyins (that is to say, the Çatapatha-Brâhmana) there are only two accents, the acute and the grave But O has once more a version of its own, stating that the authorities here referred to would not, like Âgniveçyâyana, annul rule 31 simply, but would also deny the rules in general for the enclitic circumflex, as in *sá idhânáh* (iv 4 4[5]) and *prapâ'* (? MS *prathâ*) *asi* (ii 5 12[4]) We cannot well hesitate to prefer the latter interpretation, there has been no question here of the independent circumflex, and a denial of its existence would be altogether out of place and impertinent Nor is the reference to the Çatapatha-Brahmana one at all likely to have been intended by the Prâtiçâkhya And it is not true, except so far as the mode of designating the accents is concerned, that that treatise has no circumflex accent it writes, to be sure, only the *anudâtta* sign, so that, if the value of this were the same as in the other usual systems of designation, all its syllables would be either grave or acute and on this foundation, later Hindu systematists have declared them such, and painfully elaborated an exposition of them (see Weber's Ind Studien, x 397 ff)

Rules 32 and 33 are, naturally enough, declared unapproved, but to us it is both interesting and important to find that there were Hindu phonetists in the ancient time who did not admit such an element of utterance as the enclitic circumflex

---

CHAPTER XV

CONTENTS 1–3 nasalization of vowels, or insertion of *anusvâra*, in cases of the loss or alteration of *n* or *m*, 4–5, the same, in the cases detailed in the next chapter, 6–8, the same, in the case of certain finals, 9, utterance in monotone

---

33 *na kevalam udâttât parah kim tu sarva eva saptavidha-svarito nâ 'stî 'ty eke çâkhino manyante tathâ hi vâjasaneyi-brâhmane*[1] *dvâv eva svarâu udâttaç câ 'nudâttaç ca*

ne 'dam sûtradvayam[2] *ishtam*

O substitutes *eke çakhino manyante na kevalanudâttah udattassuritaparah pratishidhyati kim tarhi udattakapurvakaç ca sa– – prathâ– – – ne 'dam* etc

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
caturdaço[3] *'dhyâyah*

[1] W *vâjanepibrâ* , B *-nehibr-*, G M *neyabr-* [2] W *-tram* [3] G M O *dvitiye praçne dvitîyo*

नकारस्य रेफोष्मयकारभावाल्लुप्ते च मलोपाच्च पूर्वस्वरो ऽनुनासिकः ॥ १ ॥

1 In case of the conversion of *n* into *r*, a spirant, or *y*—also when the *y* is omitted—or in case of the omission of *m*, the preceding vowel becomes nasal

That this Prâtiçâkhya takes no distinct and consistent ground upon the question whether the so called *anusvâra* consists in a nasalization of the vowel or in a nasal consonantal element following the vowel, has been already pointed out (note to ii 30), as also, that the present rule is the one where the former view is most unequivocally taken As the school to which the commentator belongs has adopted the other view, he declares (under rule 2) that the doctrine here laid down is unapproved

The "conversion of *n* into *r* or a spirant" is, of course, the retention of a historical final *s* after *n* unchanged before *t* (vi 14), or changed to *ç* before *c* (v 20), or to *r* before a vowel (ix 20 etc), its "conversion into *y*," with the (invariably) consequent "loss of the *y*" (ix 20 etc , x 19), goes back to the same cause The commentator's illustrative examples are *agnîn̆r apsushadah* (v 6 1[2]), *sa trîn̆r ekâdaçân̆ iha* (iii 2 11[3] found in O only), *karnân̆ç câ 'kar-nân̆ç ca* (i 8 9[3]), *trîn̆s trcân* (ii 5 10[1]), and *mahân̆ indrah* (i.4 20 et al), of which the last is by part of the MSS , rather needlessly, quoted twice, once for the conversion of the *n* into *y* (for which it should be written *mahân̆y indrah*), and again for the loss of the *y* For the loss of *m* (by xiii 2), the examples are *pratyushtan̆ rakshah* (i 1 2[1] et al) and *san̆çitam me* (iv 1 10[3] et al)

The commentator explains *anunâsika* by *sânunâsika*, as if the word were properly a noun, and needed reduction to adjective form in this treatise, however, it is always and only an adjective, meaning 'nasal' (see note to ii 30)

नैकेषाम् ॥ २ ॥

2 Some deny this

---

1 [1]*nakârasya rephabhâvâd ûshmabhâvâd yakârabhâvâc cakârâkrshtayakâre lupte ca*[2] *sati* [3]*makâralopâc ca*[3] *pûrvasvaro 'nunâsiko*[1] *bhavati sânunâsiko bhavatî 'ty arthah* [4]*yathâ rephabhâvât*[4] *agn- ---* [5]*sa---* [5] [6]*atho 'shmabhâvât* [6] *karn----* *trîn̆s-- --* [7]*yakârabhâvâd yathâ*[7] *mahân̆----* [8]*yakâre lupte yathâ*[9] *mahân̆----* [8] [10]*atha makârulopât* [10] *praty----,* *san̆----* [11]*ity âdi*[11] *makârasya lopo makâralopah*[12] *tasmât*

(1) wanting in B [2] O om (3) W om (4) O om (5) in O only (6) O om , G M om *atha* (7) O om , G M om *yathâ* (8) W O om [9] G M om (10) O om , G M om *atha* (11) O om [12] B *malo-*

This is a mere introduction to the next rule, which informs us what the doctrine is which these dissidents hold instead The commentator pronounces it the approved doctrine for this *çâkhâ*

ततस्त्वनुस्वारः ॥ ३ ॥

3 And claim that, on the contrary, *anusvâra* is inserted after the vowel

The *anusvâra* here prescribed is called by the commentator an *âgama*, 'increment' Its insertion is the alternative view to the nasalization of the vowel, and, as is pointed out, is held where that nasalization is denied—of which denial, the *tu*, 'on the contrary,' is the sign in the rule There is one example given *sa trîn̐r ekâdaçân̐ iha* (iii 2 11[3] W B omit *sa*)

The approval of this rule is, of course, involved in that of its predecessor, and the usage of the recorded Tâittirîya text corresponds

स्रादिषु चैकपद ऊष्मपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4 *Anusvâra* is also inserted in the case of *sra* etc, in a single word, before a spirant

"Also" (*ca*) in the rule, we are told, brings down the implication of the above specified increment The *srâdayas*, '*sra* etc,' are the whole detail, given in the next chapter, of the occurrence of *anusvâra* in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ otherwise than as the result of the rules of combination, implied in rules 1–3 of this chapter The precept, then, is introductory to the detail referred to, and also lays down some general limitations affecting it The commentator quotes a single case, *çon̐sâ moda ive 'ti* (iii 2 9[5] it falls under xvi 2), and then gives counter examples, establishing the restrictions made *tâsâm trîni ca* (ii 5 8[3]) shows that the insertion is made only under the circumstances defined in chapter xvi, *tam mâ san̐ srja varcasâ* (i 4 45[3] et al only G M have *varcasâ*) and *prastaram â hi sîda* (ii 6 12[6] found in O only) show that it is to

---

2 *ekeshâm mate pûrvasûtrokteshu* [1] *sânunâsikyam*[2] *na*[3] *bhavati uktâny evo 'dâharanâni*

idam [4]*eve 'shtam*[4] *na tu pûrvam*

[1] O ins *sthâneshu* [2] G M *na 'nu-* [3] W G M O om [(4)] O *eva sutram ish-*

3. *tata iti sarvanâmnâ parâmrshtât*[1] *svarât*[2] *paro 'nusvâra*[3] *âgamo bhavati yathâ*[4] *sa----* *parâmrshtasvarasyâ*[5] *'nunâsikam*[6] *gunam tuçabdo nivartayatî*[7] *'ti*[8] *tasmâd anunâsikapratishedhapaksha*[9] *evâ 'yam anusvârâgamah syât*

[1] G M *-shta* [2] G M *-ra* [3] B G M *-svâr* [4] G M om [5] O *shtât svarâ* [6] G M *-ka* [7] O *varay-* [8] G M O om *iti* [9] W B *dhat p-*, G M *-dhah vak shyamâna*

be made only in a single word—that is to say, if I understand the meaning, that if *mâ sâm* and *hi sîda* were single words, they would fall respectively under rules 8 and 13 of the next chapter, and have the increment—, and *mâyâ mâyinâm* (iii 1 11⁷) shows that a spirant must follow (*mâyinâm* otherwise falling under xvi 8) To the specification *ekapade*, 'in a single word,' the commentator adds in his paraphrase the explanation *akhandapade*, 'in an undivided word,' and then, in his illustration, he treats this as a restriction or limitation, and establishes it by an example, *trishâhasro vâi* (v 6 8³, p *tri-sâhasrah*), rule xvi 25 would otherwise require the increment after *tri*

नान्तविकारात्पूर्वः ॥ ५ ॥

5 Not before an altered final

The illustrative example is *bahis te astu bâl iti* (iii 3 10² G M omit the last two words) we have in it a *s* following *hi* in a single undivided word, and hence, by xvi 13, should have to read *bahiñs*, but for this restriction The alteration is from *h* to *s*, according to ix 2 As counter-example is given *mâ hiñsîi dvipâdam* (iv 2 10¹ G M O omit the last word), a case falling under the rule already referred to

अप्रगृह्याः समानाक्षराण्यनुनासिकान्येकेषाम् ॥ ६ ॥

6 According to some authorities, the simple vowels, except the *pragrahas*, are nasalized

This and the remaining rules of the chapter have the aspect of an intrusion, as they interrupt the natural connection of what precedes and what follows, and merely give the view of certain authorities on points which the Prâtiçâkhyas in general leave untouched They are brought in here as having to do with nasalized vowels, which are the subject of this chapter and its successor

With the nasalization thus taught is to be compared that noticed in the Rik Prât (at i 16, i 63, lxiv), which teaches that the first

---

4 [1]*âgamânvâdeçakaç cakârah srâdishv ekapade 'khandapade*[2] *ûshmaparo*[1] *'nusvârâgamo bhavati yathâ*[3] *çoñsâ---- srâdishv iti kim tâsâm---- ekapada iti kim tam----* [4]*prast----*[4] *akhandaviçeshanena*[5] *kim trish---- ûshmapara iti kim mâyâ----*

(1) wanting in B [2] O *pada* [3] G M O om [4]) in O only [5] O *shena*

5 *na khalu padântavikârât*[1] *pûrvasminn anusvârâgamo bhavati yathâ*[2] *bahis---- hipujigâ* (xvi 13) *iti prâptih antavikârâd iti kim mâ--- antasya vikâro 'ntavikârah tasmâd antavikârât*[3]

[1] W *vik-* [2] G M O om [3] G M om

eight vowels (namely *a, â, i, î, u, û, r, r̂*) are by [some ?] teachers declared nasal when they are not *pragrhya*, and stand as finals before a pause This is different, first, in including *r* and *r̂* (which are not *samânâksharâni* according to our treatise compare i 2, but the difference amounts to nothing, as the vowels in question never occur *avasâne*, but only *avagrahe*), and secondly, in limiting the nasalization to finals, before a pause But it is perfectly evident that our rule also applies to finals only, and, as we shall see, the commentator resorts to great violence to bring in the implication of "final" in rule 8, below Again, the specification "in *samhitâ* also," in rule 8, and the interpretation of *padam* in rule 7 as signifying *padakâle*, 'in *pada*-text,' sufficiently prove that the present precept does not apply in *samhitâ*—that is, that *avasâne*, '*in pausâ*,' is implied here And the absence of statement or *anuvrtti* of these two essential implications is strong additional evidence that the rules are interpolated

By most of the MSS, only one example is given, namely *kulâyinî vasumatî* (iv 3 4[1]), which, if our understanding, as above explained, is correct, is to be read, in *pada*-text, *kulâyinîn̐ vasumatîn̐* O adds *aminanta evâih* (iii 1 11[5]), one of the cases of suspended combination falling under x 13, and (by R Pr ii 31,32) in the Rig Veda requiring nasalization of the uncombined final its citation seems to indicate that O would not limit the operation of the rule to the *pada*-text To show that the nasalization does not take place in uncombinable vowels, or *pragrahas*, are quoted, in *pada*-form, *amî iti* (iii 3 7[1] et al) and *tanû iti* (ii 2 7[5] omitted in O) To illustrate the limitation to simple vowels, we find in most MSS *so evâi 'shâi 'tasya* (ii 2 9[7]), but O gives instead *agnaye 'nîkavate* (i 8 4[1] et al), *vishnav e 'hî 'dam* (ii 4 12[3]), and *vâyav ishtaye* (ii 2 12[8])

The commentator, as he has done repeatedly before (under i 49, ii 7, v 2), notices the apposition in the rule of *apragrahâh* and *samânâksharâni*, two words of different gender He signifies, further, under the next rule, that both that and this are unapproved

पदं च प्लुतं शाङ्खायनकाण्डमायनयोः ॥७॥

7 As is also, according to Çânkhâyana and Kândamâyana, a protracted *pada*

By *pada* is here signified, according to the commentator, a word

6. [1] *yâni samânâksharâny apragrahasamjñâni tâny* [2]*ekeshâm mate bhavanty*[2] *anunâsikâni*[3] [4] *kul-....* *apragrahâ iti kim amî iti* [5]*tanû iti*[5] *samânâksharânî 'ti kim* [6]*so.... pragrahâksharaçabdayor niyatalingatayâ*[7] *parasparânvayo ghatate na pragrahâ apragrahâh*[6]

[1] O ins *ekeshâm âcâryânâm mate* [2] O om [3] O *-kagunani patashante* [4] O ins *am ....* [5] O om [6] O *agn-...* *vish ...* *vay ...* [7] W *niyamal*

in the *pada*-text, and the interpretation, as was remarked above, is fully supported by the specification of *samhitâ* in the next rule.

As examples of nasalized protracted vowels, are given *tvî3 ity abravît* (ii 4 12[6]) and *astu hî3 ity abrûtâm* (vii 1 6[1]), both in *samhitâ*-form, although it is again expressly pointed out that the nasalization is not made in *samhitâ*: the two worthies referred to would read *tvĩ3* and *hĩ3*. It is added that *ca*, 'also,' in this rule effects its connection with what is prescribed in the preceding one—or, as O., in more customary phrase, expresses it, brings forward by implication the preceding rule.

Some, we are further informed, restrict the application of the precept to words which contain a single vowel protracted, and would not regard it as authorizing nasalization in *na chinattî3 iti* (i 7 2[1,4]) or *na viciteyâ3 iti* (vi 1 9[1]: G. M. omit *iti*).

The rule is declared to be of no binding force.

अकारस्तु सꣳहितायामपि ॥ ८ ॥

8. An *a*, however, is nasalized in *samhitâ* also.

The commentator's explanation is that nasality and protraction are here implied (from the preceding rule) by vicinage, and that *tu*, 'however,' is intended to annul the implication that only the opinion of the two authorities specified in rule 7 is reported. And though the comprehensive statement "an *a*" is made in the rule, nevertheless, in virtue of rule i 58, "continued implication is of that which is last (or final)," the "also" (*api*) really brings down only a final *a* as suffering a prescribed effect by the attribution of nasal quality. The sense, then, is that a protracted final *a* is nasalized, both in *samhitâ* and elsewhere. Examples are *suçlokã3 sumañgalã3* (i 8 16[2]), *upahûtã3* (ii 6 7[3]), *yaço mamã3* (vii 4 20); these are, in fact, all the cases of protraction of simple final *a* which the text contains, and the edition (so far as it goes) and my MS. nasalize the *â*, as required by the interpretation of the rule here given. The cases are much more numerous in which a final *ah* exhibits *â3* as the ultimate result of protraction, the *h* being lost before a following vowel or sonant consonant: namely, at i 5 9[6]; v 5 1[3],3[2] twice; vi 1 9[1] twice, 3 8[1], 4 3[4], 6 2[3]; and in one place, vi 5 8[4], the same final *â3* comes from a protracted *e*: the question might possibly arise whether these do not also fall under

---

7. *yat*[1] *plutavat padam*[2] [3]*tac ca*[3] *padakâle* [4]*çâñkhâyanakândamâyanayor mate*[4] *'nunâsikam bhavati yathâ*[5] *tvî3.... astu .... padam iti kim samhitâyâm mâ bhût cakâraḥ*[6] *pûrvasûtroktavidheyasamuccayam*[7] *karoti*[8] *apara âhuḥ* [9]*plutâikasvaram padam iti anyam mâ bhût*[9] *na.... na ...*

ne 'dam sûtradvayam[10] *ishtam*

[1] W. *yatra*. [2] O. om. [(3)] W. *tatra*. [(4)] O. puts after *bhavati*. [5] G. M. om. [6] G. M. O. *caçabdah*. [7] O. *-vidhim*. [8] O. *anvâdiçati*. [(9)] O. *plutevarnapadam iti 'ha mâ bhût*. [10] W. *sutram*.

the rule, but it would have to be answered in the negative (see the counter-examples below), and the text reads accordingly The manuscripts of the commentary give as found "in another *çâkhâ*," one example, read *brahmâ3n* in W B (O is wanting), and *yadghrâ* in G M I do not quite know what to make of this, as there seems to be no call for quoting from another text examples of what is capable of being fully illustrated from the received Veda of the school, *brahmâ3n* is found at i 8 16^{1} twice, ^{2} twice, but would be a counter-example to this rule, its *a* not being final, it is, in fact, of the same character with the first of the counter-examples given These are *satyam âjâ3n* (i 8 16^{2}), *agnâ3 ity âha* (vi 5 8^{4} W has dropped out *agnâ3*), and *vicityah somâ3 na vicityâ3 iti* (vi 1 9^{1} O has only this)

Finally, the commentator remarks that Çankhâyana and Kândamâyana also accept this principle He may well say this, for the natural interpretation of the rule is to make it represent simply the view of those authorities, and the action of the comment, in cutting it loose from its predecessors, and declaring it alone to express the approved doctrine of the treatise, is in a high degree forced and arbitrary It was noticed under i 58 what an unjustifiable act of violent interpretation was there committed, by way of preparation for this one The implication of "final" is not needed in rule 8 any more than in rules 6 and 7, and is clearly enough made in them all, whence it comes, it would be the business of those who put the passage in to tell, if they could

The Ath Prât gives (at i 105) an enumeration of the protracted vowels occurring in the text to which it relates This our treatise omits to do, and it may be well to repair the omission in this place A final *a* is protracted to *âñ3* at i 8 16^{2} twice ii 6 7^{3} vii 4 20 ——*ah* to *â3h* at i 4 27 v 5 1^{3}, and to *â3* (the *h* being lost) at i 5 9^{6} v 5 1^{3},3^{2} twice vi 1 9^{1} twice, 3 8^{1}, 4 3^{4}, 6 2^{3} ——*an* to *â3n* at i 8 16^{1} twice, 16^{2} thrice ii 6 5^{6} ——*am* to *â3m* at vi 1 4^{5}, 5 9^{1} vii 1 7^{4}, 5 7^{1} twice ——*i* to *î3* at i 7 2^{1,4} ii 4 12^{6} vi 5 9^{1} vii 1 6^{1},7^{4} ——*ih* to *î3h* or *î3r* at i 5 9^{6} vi 3 10^{1} ——*in* to *î3n* at vii 4 20 twice ——*uh* to *û3r* at vi 3 8^{1} ——*e* to *â3i* at i 4 27 vi 1 4^{5}, and

---

8 *sâmnidhyâd anunâsikaplutâu*[1] *grhyete tuçabdah prakrtâcâryamatanivartakah*[2] *ata*[3] *eva*[4] *samhitâyâm asamhitâyâm*[5] *câ 'kârah padântah pluto 'nunâsiko bhavati yady apy akâra iti*[6] *sâmânyeno 'ktah tathâ 'py anvâdeço 'ntyasya* (i 58) *iti vacanâd apiçabdo 'nunâsikadharmatayâ nimittinam padântam evâ 'kâram anvâdiçati yathâ*[7] *suçl-.... upa-....* [8]*yaço-.... brahmâ3n*[9] *ity anyasyâm*[10] *çâkhâyâm*[8] *apiçabdah kimarthah* [11]*saty-... agn-....*[11] *vicityah-.... çânkhâyanakândamâyanayor apy ayam vidhir* [12]*akâre plute sammatah*[12]

[1] G M *-plute* [2] O *purvacary-* [3] W *eta*, M *tata* [4] O om [5] W O om [6] O om [7] B O om [(8)] O om [9] G M *yadghrâ* [10] G M *asya* [(11)] O om [(12)] G M *raplutas sammatam*

to *â* (see i 4) at vi 5 8[4] ——*âu* to *âsv* at vi 6 2[3] The protracted syllable has always the acute accent

सर्वमेकयमं पूर्वेषाꣳ सर्वमेकयमं पूर्वेषाम् ॥ ९ ॥

9 According to the former ones, all is of one pitch

The comment is completely at a loss as to how this rule is to be understood, and gives three more or less discordant interpretations of it, the first of which we are probably to regard as the preferred one, if there be a preference "All" means 'every kind of articulate sound,' "of one pitch" is equivalent to *ekaçruti*, *yama* denoting the tone of an acute syllable, "the former ones" are 'the sacrificers,' the meaning is, then, that in the sacrificial usage of the sacrificers everything is uttered in acute monotone O has an exposition of its own, which is in great part too corrupt to be read without considerable emendation, and which conducts to the same conclusion it quotes, *apropos* of *pûrve*, a *pada* of a *trishtubh* verse from some sacred text, "the former ones spoke those words to the former ones"

The second interpretation differs from the first only in declaring *pûrve*, 'the former ones,' to designate certain *çâkhinah*, or 'holders of a Vedic text'

The third is of quite another character, it makes *yama* to be equivalent to *svara* in the sense of 'vowel,' and explains 'every monosyllable is nasalized'—the intent being to annul the restriction to simple vowels only (as made in rule 6) Who the *pûrve* are, is not told us this time

The commentator consoles himself at the end by declaring the rule not approved We may fairly extend the same condemnation

---

9 [1]*sarvam*[2] *varnajâtam*[3] *ekayamam ekaçrutî 'ti pûrveshâm*[4] *matam yamo nâma svara*[5] *udâtta ity arthah pûrve nâma yâjñikâh*[6] *teshâm yajñakarmani sarvam*[7] *ekaçruti*[8] *bhavati*[1]

anye manyante[9] *pûrve nâma kecic châkhinah teshâm sarvam*[10] [11]*ekaçrutî 'ti*[11]

athâ[12] *'pare kathayanti*[13] *sarvam ekasvaram anunâsikam bhavatî 'ti*[14] [15]*samânâksharamâtrâpekshâm adhikshepturn*[15]

ne 'dam sûtram ishtam

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
pañcadaço[16] *'dhyâyah*

(1) O substitutes *sarvam iti lakshyam lakshanavishayam grhnati ekayam ekaçrutih yamaçrutisvara ity athântarâ pûrveshâ purvâi nâma yâjñikâ purve pûrvebhyo vaca etad ucur iti darçanat yâjñikânâm yajñakarmani sarvam ekaçrutir bhavati* [2] W B *sarva* [3] B *varnam ajñatam*, G M *tayamam* [4] W *sarv* [5] G M put after *udâtta* [6] W *-ñiyâh* [7] W puts after *bhavati* [8] B *-tir* [9] O *âhuh* [10] O om (11) W *-çrutâni*, O *-çrutir bhavati* [12] G M om *atha* [13] O *vyâcakshate* [14] O om *iti* [15] O *sarvam iti samânâksharânâm apekshâ grahavyudâsa sarvam tathâ vidhiyate*, W *-ramatrâpekshâm apikshiptam*, B *-ksham adh* , G M *mâtrapaksham âksheptum* [16] G M O *dvitiyapraçne trtiyo*

to his treatment of it, and conjecture that, if he could only have told us what it meant, we might have found in it something to approve We are tempted to seek in it some statement as to the accent of the protracted syllable, or *pada*, and, if it were allowed to amend *pûrveshâm* to *ekeshâm*, we might translate, 'some hold that the whole word in which protraction occurs is to be uttered in the same tone'—only then, to be sure, we should look for a statement of the usage actually followed in the text

---

CHAPTER XVI

CONTENTS 1–31, detail of the cases of occurrence, in the Sanhitâ, of *ṅ* in the interior of a word, before a spirant.

अथ सकारपराः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for cases in which *s* follows

A simple heading, of force through a considerable part of the chapter (i e through rule 13) The essential item of the precept laid down was given above, in xv 4, which directed that in all the cases to be specified in this chapter is to be assumed the presence of *anusvâra* following a vowel and followed by a spirant Words in which that spirant is *s* form by far the most numerous class, and until rule 14 they alone are treated

The Rik Pr is the only one of the other treatises which offers anything at all analogous with this enumeration, it (at xiii 7–10) gives rules for the occurrence of *anusvâra* after long vowels only

स्रशोह्पाश पदाद्यः स्वरपरे ॥ २ ॥

2 *Sra*, *ço*, *ha*, *pâ*, and *ça*, at the beginning of a *pada*, take *anusvâra* before a *s* that is followed by a vowel

The commentator cites examples, as follows For *sra*, *visraṅsayed amehenâ 'dhvaryuh* (vi 2 9^4,10^7 G M O have only the first word), we have other cases at ii 5 7^2 v 1 6^1 vii 3 10^3, all from the same root, *sras* For *ço*, *çoṅsâ moda ive 'ti* (iii 2 9^5 G M omit the last word, O the last two), I have noted no other case as counter-example, to show that only *o* after *ç* takes the increment, is given *âçâsânâ sâumanasam* (i 1 10^1 O alone has the latter

---

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah iti uttare grahanaviçeshâh*[1] *sakâraparâ*[2] *ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam sakârah paro* [3]*yebhyas te sakâraparâh*[3]

[1] B *shah* [2] B *'para* (3) G M *yasmât sa tathoktah* (and *-parah* in the rule)

word) For *ha*, *hañsah çucishad* (i 8 15² iv 2 1⁵), various other cases of *hañsa* are found in the text, and *hañsi* that *hâ* is not treated in the same way is shown by *prajâ mâ mâ hâsît* (v 6 8¹ O omits) For *pâ*, *pâñsura irâvatî* (i 2 13²), other cases are *pâñsûn* and *pâñsavyâya*, at ii 6 10² and iv 5 9¹ respectively that *pa* would not have been correct is shown by *âhatam gabhe pasah* (vii 4 19³ O omits *âhatam*), *pâsi*, which would seem to fall under the rule, is excepted by rule 17, below For *ça*, *yad âsînah çañsati tasmât* (iii 2 9⁷ W B G M omit *tasmât*, thus allowing the citation to be found also at iii 2 9⁶), cases of this combination, all of them coming from the root *çañs*, are not infrequent in the Sanhitâ As general counter-examples, we have, to establish the necessity of the restriction "at the beginning of a *pada*," *agnir ukthena vâhasâ* (i 5 11¹), *somam pipâset* (ii 1 10¹), and *dahâ* "*çasah* (i 2 14⁶ O omits), while *tasmât sa visrasyah* (vi 2 9⁴,10⁷ only O has the first two words), *hastayoh* (iv 1 5³ et al G M O omit), and *kaviçastâh* (ii 6 12⁶ all the MSS have *-çastah*, which I have not found in the text, but probably by my own fault) do the same service for the specification "when a vowel follows"

The commentator goes on to say that some authorities accept *hi* as a part of this rule which is not to be approved, since "at the beginning of a word" is here implied, and so *ahiñsâyâi* (v 2 8⁷) would be left without the increment And if it be pleaded that *hiñsîh parame* (iv 2 10¹ ² et al) should be an example here, the reply is made, that the *anusvâra* is assured to it by rule 13, below, where there is no restriction to the beginning of a word, and that to repeat here the specification of *hi* would be useless The only criticism to be offered upon this is that the objection has too little reason to be really worthy of notice

---

2 *sra ço ha pâ ça ity ete grahanaviçeshâh*[1] *padâdayah sakâraparâs tasmint sakâre svarapare saty anusvârâgamam*[2] *bhajante*[3] *yathâ*[4] *vi-.... çoñsâ.... okârena kim âçâ-.... hañsah.... *[5]*hrasva iti kim prajâ....*[5] *pâñsura.... dîrghena*[6] *kim âh-.... yad.... padâdaya iti kim agnir.... somam.... *[7]*dahâ....*[7] *svarapara iti kim. tasmât.... *[8]*has-....*[8] *kav-....*

*kecid atra sûtre *[9]*higrahanam*[10] *angîkurvate*[11] *tad anupapannam padâdaya iti niyamât ahiñsâyâ ity atrâ 'nusvârâbhâvaprasangât*[12] *nanu hiñsîh.. . ity etad atro 'dâharanam iti cet mâi 'vam *[13]*hipujigâ* (xvi 13) *ity atra niyamâbhâvât padâdâv apadâdâu ca*[9] *higrahanasya kâryasiddheh punar atra grahanam vyartham*[13]

svarah paro yasmâd asâu svaraparah tasmin

[1] G M *-naparâh viç-* [2] O *-ma* [3] O *syât* [4] G M O om [5] O om, G M *hrasvena kim* etc [6] O *-ghe* [7] O om [8] G M O om [9] W om [10] G M *him* [11] G M *angimk-* [12] G M *rabhâ-*, O *râbodhapra* [13] B om

विकृते ऽपि ॥३॥

3 Even when the vowel is altered

That is to say, even when the vowel that is by the last rule required to follow the *s* has undergone euphonic alteration, so as to become a consonant A single example is cited, *apahañsy agne* (iv 7 13[1], p *apa-hañsi*), if the text contains any others, they have escaped my notice

रापूर्वश्च ॥४॥

4 As also, when they are preceded by *râ*

This rule is made for the purpose of establishing a single additional case under the general rule given above (xvi.2), namely, the word *nârâçañsîbhyah* (vii 5 11[2]), the case being one, as the comment points out, where the *ça* is not at the beginning of a *pada* The *ca*, 'also,' brings down only *ça*, and we are assured that this is the reason why *ça* was mentioned last in rule 2, even at the cost of a violation of the natural order of the vowels Of this point we need not make much, since the rule contains other and unexplained violations of alphabetic order

शंस्तानन्तोदात्ते ॥५॥

5 Also in *çañstâ*, except when it is accented on the final syllable

Here is another single case, falling under rule 2 by the suspension of one of the restrictions laid down in that rule—namely, that the *s* be followed by a vowel The passage is *utá çáñstâ súviprah* (iv 6 8[2] O omits *suviprah*) The restriction as to accent

---

3 *apiçabdah svarânvâdeçakah*[1] *sakârât pare tasmint svare vikrtam âpanne 'pi vyañjanatâm upagate 'pi syâd*[2] *anusvâravidhih*[3] *yathâ apa-* ----

[1] B *sakaran-* [2] W and O (?) *svarad* [3] *lacuna* in O, from (*anusvara-*) *vidhih* to *svara* under the next rule

4 [1]*caçabdah srâdishu*[1] *çakâram anvâdiçati*[2] *etadartham eva svaravyatyaye*[3] *'pi çakâragrahanam tatrâ 'nte krtam râ ity evampûrvah çakârah sakâraparo 'nusvârâgamam bhajate yathâ*[4] *nâr-* ---- *apadâdyartho*[5] *'yam ârambhah*

(1) W *çabdasyadishu*, B *sacaçabdâdishu* [2] W B ins *cakarah* [3] G M *vyaktaye*, O begins again with *vyatyaye* [4] G M O om [5] W O *apadârtho*

5 *çañstâ ity etasmin*[1] *grahane 'nantodâtte*[2] *sakârapare bhavaty*[3] *anusvârâgamah uta* ---- *anantodâtta*[4] *iti kim açv-* ---- *sraçoha* (xvi 2) *iti prâptâu satyâm*[5] *sakârasya*[6] *svaraparatvâ-*

is intended to exclude *áçvasyâ viçastá'* (iv 6 9[3] O adds *dvâ yam-*)

अशंसन् ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also in *açansan*

Yet another case belonging with those disposed of by rule 2, but requiring special treatment because the *ça* in it does not stand "at the beginning of a *pada*" The passage is *abhi vy açansan* (vi 6 11[5])

O, in an added paragraph, brings forward the objection that, in virtue of rule i 52 (which makes the citation of any word include also the same word with *a* prefixed), *açansan* has its *ṅ* already assured by rule 2, but refutes it by pointing out that the principle appealed to has to do only with a *pada* or word, not with a mere fragment of one, like *ça* (compare rule 10, below) It adds that "another reading is *çansân*"

न शसनं विशसनेन ॥ ७ ॥

7 But not in *çasanam* and *viçasanena*

These are exceptions, the only ones the Sanhita affords, under rule 2 The passages are *çasanam vâjy arvâ* (iv 6 7[5] O ends with *vâjî*) and *çuno viçasanena* (v 7 23)

T and O have the simple *pada çasanena*, instead of *viçasanena* (p *vi-çasanena*) in the rule, and O reads the same in its comment This is doubtless an emendation, and makes a reading more strictly in accordance with the approved usage of the treatise The comment has (especially in the fourth chapter) explained away many a like inaccuracy by the allegation of a phrase "in another *çâkhâ*" and we might expect to find added here *vî 'ti kim âçansanene 'ti çâkhântare*

---

bhâve 'pi nâ 'yam vidhir nishidhyatâm[7] *iti grahanam*[8] *anta*[9] *udâtto yasya tad antodâttam* [10]*nâ 'ntodâttam*[10] *anantodâttam tasmin* [11]

[1] O *asmin* [2] W B O *antod* [3] O *syad* [4] W *antod* [5] G M om [6] W B *çak-* [7] G M ins *eva* [8] B *padagr-* [9] W O *ante* [(10)] O om [11] O adds *apadâdyartho iti anetanâi* (which belongs at the end of the comment on rule 6)

6 *açansann ity asmin grahane syâd anusvârâgamah abhi* ---- [1]*apadâdyartho 'yam ârambhah*[1]

[1] O puts at end of comment on rule 5, and adds, partly there and partly here (a little amended), *kimartham idam sraçohapaça* (xvi 2) *ity anenâi 'va tatsiddhau apy akâradi* (i 52) *'ti vacanât mâi 'vam apy akaradi 'ti vacanam padasya padavayavah çaçabdah çansânn iti pâthântaram*

7 *çasanam viçasanena*[1] *ity etayor grahanayor*[2] *anusvârâgamo na syât ças-* ---- *çuno* ---- *sraçoha* (xvi 2) *iti prâptih*

[1] O, *ças-*, as also (with T) in the rule itself, [2] O om

मा पदादिरनुदात्तः ॥ ८ ॥

8 *Mâ* takes *anusvâra* when beginning a *pada* and unaccented

All the implications of rule 2 are here cut off (as is distinctly enough intimated by the express repetition of one of them, *padâdi*), and hence it is to be understood that the increment takes place before a *s* whether this be or be not followed by a vowel The examples are *áhar mâñsêna* (v 7 20) and *mâñspácanyâh* (iv 6 9[1]) The restriction to the beginning of a *pada* is established by quoting *sîhkamadhyamâsah* (iv 6 7[4]), that as to the accent, by *mâ'sam dîkshitâh syât* (v 6 7[3] only O has *syât*)

So far as I have discovered, this rule applies only to forms and combinations of *mâñsa*, which are not infrequent in the Sanhita The four following rules give it certain extensions and limitations

पुमीपूर्वश्च नित्यम् ॥ ९ ॥

9 As also when preceded by *pu* or *mî*, under all circumstances

The closing specification of the rule amounts to a removal of the restriction as to accent, imposed in rule 8—that as to initial position being virtually removed by the prescribed prefixion of *pu* or *mî* The examples quoted are *ut pumâñsañ haranti* (vi 5 10[3] O omits *haranti*, and B runs the two citations together, having dropped out a part of each) and *mîmâñsante kâ'ye* (vi 2 6[4]) We have *pumâñsam* again at iv 6 6[5], and other forms of *mîmâñs* at vi 2 6[4] and vii 5 7[1] I have noted no other words as falling under the rule

सकारपरश्च ॥ १० ॥

10 And when followed by *sakâya*

The *ca*, 'and,' we are told, here brings down *mâ*, and G M add that the intent of the rule is to establish an exception under

---

8 *mâ ity evam*[1] *varnah padâdir anudâttah sakâraparo 'nusvârâgamam bhajate atra niyamâbhâvât sakârasya svaraparatvâbhâve 'pi nimittatvam bhavaty eva yathâ*[2] *ahar---- mâñs---- padâdir iti kim sîh---- anudâtta iti kim mâsam ----*

[1] G M O *ayam* [2] O om

9 *caçabdo me 'ti jñâpayati pu mî ity evampûrvo me 'ti*[1] *varnah sakâraparo nityam anusvârâgamam bhajate ut---- mîm---- anudâttatvanivartako*[2] *nityaçabdah*

[1] G M O ins *ayam* [2] O *niyamavyavar*

rule 8—that is to say, to bring under that rule a word which would otherwise be excluded in virtue of the requisition "when beginning a *pada*" The case is similar to that about which O raises a question under rule 6 The passage is *amâṅsakâya svâhâ* (vii 5 12²)

नावग्रहपूर्वः ॥ ११ ॥

11 But not when preceded by a former member of a compound

Or, 'by a pause of division (between the two members of a compound),' taking *avagraha* in its more original sense W B O define the rule as establishing exceptions under rule 8, G M, which have taken in this notification (less correctly) as part of the preceding comment, say simply that *mâ* is to be understood as implied here by vicinage The examples given are *pûrṇámâse vâ'i* (ii 5 5⁴ O omits *vâi*) and *ardhamâsê devâ'h* (ii 5 6⁶ twice) The words would satisfy all the conditions of rule 8, the separated element *-mâse* or *-mâsê* being itself (by i 48) a *pada* Since *mâṅsa* nowhere appears as the latter member of a compound, this rule exempts from the increment of *anusvâra* all the cases in which forms of *mâs* or *mâsa* are found in such a situation, others are the subject of the next following precept

मासिमासुमासोमासामिति च ॥ १२ ॥

12 Nor in *mâsi*, *mâsu*, *mâsah*, or *mâsâm*

These are words which, without special exception, would fall under rule 8 The examples for the last three are *daçâsu masâ' 'ttíshthan* (vii 5 2²), *shán mâsó dấkshinena* (vi 5 3⁴ only O has the last word), and *mâsâ'm prátishthityâi* (vii 5 1⁶) we have *mâsáh* also at vii 5 7¹, and *mâsâ'm* at v 7 18 The first, *mâsi*, raises a difficulty Some, the commentator says, cite in illustration of it *prathamê mâsí prshthâ'ni* (vii 5 3¹ O omits the last word), but this is wrong, for the exemption of *mâsi* in that passage is assured by rule 17, below we are to assume, then, the occurrence in another text of some word of more than two syllables beginning

---

10 *caçabdo me 'ti jñâpayati me 'ty evam*[1] *varṇah sakâyaparo*[2] *'nusvârâgamam*[3] *bhajate am-....* [4]

[1] B G M O *ayam* [2] W B *sakârap* [3] G M *nityam anu-* [4] G M add *mâ padâdir anudatta* (xvi 8) *ity asya 'yam apavadah*

11 [1]*mâ padâdir anudâtta* (xvi 8) *ity asyâ 'yam apavâdah*[1] *avagrahapûrvo me 'ty evam*[2] *varno nâ*[3] *'nusvârâgamam bhajate yathâ*[4] *pûrn-.... ardha-.... avagrahah pûrvo yasmâd*[5]*asâv avagrahapûrvah*[5]

(1) G M have this as part of the comment on the preceding rule, and substitute here *sannidhyan mâ iti labhyate* [2] B G M O *ayam* [3] B om *na* [4] G M O om (5) G M *sa tathoktah*, W om *asâv*

with *mâsi* This interpretation is, of course, forced and false *mâsi* is included with the rest here because it is an example of the same class with them, and the makers of the treatise, when they put it in, either overlooked or neglected the fact that it falls technically under rule 14, and so also under rule 17, establishing exceptions to 14 We have also *masi-mâsi*, more than once, at vii 5 1[6]

ह्रिपुजिगाजिघाश्चंसिनेऽतंसयदातांसीत्कनीयाज्याया-द्राघीयारघीयाश्रेयाह्रसीयावसीयाभूयांसोजक्षिवाजघ्निवा-जिगिवाजीगिवातस्थिवादाश्वादीदिवापपिवापीपिवावि-द्वाविविशिवाशुश्रुवासस्रुवा ॥ १३ ॥

13 The following words have *anusvâra* before *s* *hi*, *pu*, *jigâ*, *jighâ*, *chan̆sine*, *atan̆sayat*, *âtân̆sît*, *kanîyâ*, *jyâyâ*, *drâghîyâ*, *raghîyâ*, *çreyâ*, *hrasîyâ*, *vasîya*, *bhûyân̆sah*, *jakshivâ*, *jaghnivâ*, *jigivâ*, *jîgivâ*, *tasthivâ*, *dâçvâ*, *dîdivâ*, *papivâ*, *pîpivâ*, *vidvâ*, *vivigivâ*, *çuçruvâ*, *sasrvâ*

The commentator's examples are as follows *hin̆sîh parame vyoman* (iv 2 10 [2,3] O omits *vyoman*, and G M substitute *mâ hin̆sîs tanuvâ*, iv 2 3[1] et al) and *cinute 'hin̆sâyâi* (v 2 8[7] O omits *cinute*), respecting this first specification, see further below,—— *tena pun̆svatîh* (ii 5 8[5]) and *pun̆sah putrân* (iv 6 9[4]) I have only noted farther two cases of *pun̆sah*, at ii 6 5[5] and vi 5 8[2],——*lokam ajigân̆san* (v 5 5[4] vi 5 8[2] O omits *lokam*) elsewhere only at iii 2 2[3],——*tvashtâram ajighân̆san* (vi 5 8[4]) the text presents fourteen other cases of *jighân̆s*,——*brâhmanâchan̆sine* (i 8 18) the only case a counter-example (but O omits all the counter-examples), *pra yuchasy ubhe ni pâsi* (i 4 22), shows the necessity of including in the citation the *ne* of *chan̆sine*,——*gabhe mushtim atan̆sayat* (vii 4 19[4]), with a counter-example, *atasam na çushkam* (i.2 14[2]), to explain the citation of the whole word *atan̆sayat*,——*anvâtân̆sît tvayi* (iv 7 13[5] O omits *tvayi*), with *anu vrâtâsas tava* (iv 6 7[3]), to prove the need of the final *ît*,——*kanîyân̆so devâh* (v 3 11[1]) the text offers half-a-dozen cases of this comparative, and about the same number of the next,——*jyâyân̆so bhrâtarah*

---

12 [1]*cakâro nishedhâkarshakah*[1] *mâsi......* *ity eteshu grahaneshu na syâd anusvârâgamah eshâm api mâ padâdir* (xvi 8) *iti prâptih kecid atra prath-....* *ity udâharanti*[2] *tad asâdhu na pade dvisvare nityam*[3] (xvi 17) *ity anenâi 'va nishedhasiddheh*[4] *tasmâd anyaçâkhâyâm*[5] *bahusvaram aparam*[6] *udâharanam avadhâranîyam daçasu....* *shan....* *mâsâm....*

(1) O om [2] W *-ranam* [3] W O *r*, G M om [4] W *dham siddhah*, B *-dhah siddhah* [5] G M *anyasyâm ç* [6] B G M *param*, O om

(ii 6 6[1] et al.),——*drâghîyâṅsâu bhavataḥ* (v 2 5[1]) the only case,——*atho raghîyâṅsaḥ* (vii 4 9) also the only case,——*pra çreyâṅsam* (ii 4 1[4] but O substitutes the only other case, *çreyâṅsam pâpîyân*, v 1 2[3]),——*atha hrasîyâṅsam âkramaṇam* (vi 6 4[2] but G M O omit the last word, thus allowing the citation to include also the only other case, found in the same division),——*vasîyâṅsam bhâgadheyena* (v 4 10[5]) there are two or three further cases,——*bhûyâṅso 'nyebhyaḥ* (vii 1 1[5]), with *annâdo bhûyâsam* (i 6 2[3] et al.) as counter-example, proving that the final *h* had to be cited with the rest of the word there are seven other cases of *bhûyâṅs* in the text,——*jakshivâṅsaḥ papivâṅsaḥ* (i 4 44[2] O omits the last word) the only case,——*vṛtraṁ jaghnivâṅsam mṛdho 'bhi* (ii 5 3[1] W B omit the first word, O the first and last, G M have only the first two, which are read also at ii 5 4[5]) I have noted the word besides only at ii 1 10[2] three times, with the negative prefix,——*vâjaṁ jigivâṅsaḥ* (i 7 8[4]) the only case,——for *jîgivâ* is found only a case "in another *çâkhâ*," namely *jîgivâṅsasya* (so W G M, though the word is not grammatically admissible, O has *jîgivâṅsamyâma* [i e *-ṅsaḥ syâma*?], B is corrupt, running the previous citation and this together into *vâjaṁ jigivâṅsaṁ iti çâkhântare*),——*dyumnâ tasthivâṅso janânâm* (i 2 14[4] O alone has the last word) there is one other case, at iv 2 2[2],——*dâçvâṅso dâçushaḥ sutam* (i 4 16 O alone has *sutam*) another case at ii 2 12[8],——*çucayo dîdivâṅsam* (ii 5 12[2]) another case at i 2 14[4],——*papivâṅsaç ca viçve* (i 4 44[2]) the only case,——*pîpivâṅsaṁ sarasvataḥ* (iii 1 11[2] O has *-tas trayaḥ*, probably corrupt for *ta stanam*, as the text reads) the only case,—*vidvâṅso vâi purâ hotâraḥ* (ii 5 11[1 2] only O has the last two words) and *avidvâṅsaç cakrma* (iv 7 15[6] O begins *vishṭâvid-*, by mutilation of the preceding word in the passage) the Sanhitâ has over thirty cases of *vidvâṅs*,——*pravivîçivâṅsaṁ îmahe* (iv 7 15[1]),——*yac chuçruvâṅsaḥ* (ii 5 9[2] twice) there is another case at v 3 4[1],——and, finally, *vâjaṅ sasrvâṅsaḥ* (i 7 8[4])

After the second example (*ahiṅsâyâi*), G M insert the remark that it is brought under the present rule by the principle of "prefixion of *a*" (i 52) This is wrong, being inconsistent with the

13 [1]*hi*------[1] *ity evampûrvaḥ sakâraparo 'nusvâra âgamo*[2] *bhavati*[3] *yathâ*[4] *hiṅsîh*---- *cin*---- [5] *tena*---- *puṅsaḥ*---- *lokam*---- *tvasht*---- *brâhm*---- [6]*na iti kim pra* ---[6] *gabhe*---- [7]*yad iti kim atasam*----[7] *anv*---- [8]*îd iti kim anu*----[8] *kan*---- *jyây*---- *drâgh*---- *atho*---- *pra* ---- *atha*---- *vasî*---- *bhûy*---- [9]*visargena kim ann*----[9] *jaksh*---- *vṛtraṁ*---- *vâjaṁ*---- *jîgivâṅsasye 'ti çâkhântare dyum*- --- [10]*dâçv*- --- *çucayo*---- *papiv*---- *pîpiv*----[10] *vidv*---- *avid*---- *pravi*---- *yac* ---- *vâjaṅ*---- [11] *dâçvâviviçivâçuçruve*[12] *'ty atra srâdishu câi 'kapada* (xv 4) *iti prâptyâ çakâraparo 'nusvârâgamaḥ kim*

exposition given under rule 2 (see note on that rule) of the reason why *hi* was not there included. *hi* here is meant not as initial only, but wherever found in a word. Since, however, it is only in this one word that *hiṅs-* occurs otherwise than as initial, it would seem better to have disposed of the single case as of those which form the subject of rules 6 and 10, and to put *hi* into 2, where it would look much more at home than here at the head of a troop of perfect participles and comparatives. And why *pu* was not put into rule 2 without any ceremony, I cannot see at all, unless I have overlooked some case or cases of its occurrence; *puṅs* is invariably initial.

The commentator raises the question why rule xv 4 does not require us to insert an *anusvâra* before the *ç* of *dâçvâ*, *viviçivâ*, and *çuçruvâ*, since these too are *srâdayah*; and he makes answer that it is because the restriction conveyed in xvi 1 is still in force. But in that case, he goes on to say, is there not a nasal increment before the *s* of *hrasîyâ*, *vasîyâ*, *tasthivâ*, and *sasrvâ*? The answer to this objection is twofold. First, the competency of the citation is pleaded—that is to say, the words being read in the rule itself without nasal, that is to be understood as their authoritative form (compare under rule 19, where this plea leads to a further discussion). Secondly, the words in question being found associated with *âtâṅsît*, *kanîyâ*, *jyâyâ*, and so on, all of which show the *anusvâra* to follow a long vowel, we are to infer that in the others also it does not follow a short vowel. The first of these answers is not such as is wont to be pleaded in this treatise, and the second is evidently very weak. I should almost prefer to assume that the difficulty was not remarked by the authors of the treatise, and that the commentators who have discovered it have been forced to make the best excuse they could for it.

A more serious objection to the rule, it seems to me, is that it mixes together cases of two different classes—those in which (*chaṅsine* etc.) the nasal appears in the word itself as cited, and those in which it is to be added before a following *s*. Of this, however, the comment takes no notice.

---

na syât. atha sakâraparâ[13] (xvi 1) *ity ûshmaviçeshasya*[14] *sakârasyâ 'nuvrttir*[15] *iti vadâmah. tarhi hrasîyâvasîyâtasthivâsasrve 'ty atra* [16]*sakârapara evâ ''gamah*[16] *kim na syât. uccâranasâmarthyâd eve 'ty prathamah*[17] *parihârah. atha vâ âtâṅsîtkanîyâjyâye 'tyâdishu sarvatra dîrghânantaram evâ 'nusvârasthânam*[18] *iti sâhacaryâd*[19] *atrâ 'pi na syâd anusvârasya hrasvânantaram*[20] *sthânam ity*[21] *aparah parihârah.*

(1) B om. 2 O *mam.* 3 G M *syât*, O *bhajate.* 4 O om. 5 G M ins. *apy akârâdi* (i 52) *prâptih.* (6) O om. (7) O om. (8) O om. (9) O om. (10) G M om. 11 G M ins. *nanu.* 12 O *vidvavivviçivasuçrushâsasrve.* 13 W om. *parâ*, G M *-para.* 14 G M *shanasya.* 15 G M O *-tter.* (16) W *makarasyâ ''gamah*, O *evâ 'nusvârâg-.* 17 G M *ma.* 18 W *-svârah.* 19 G M O *tatsâh-.* 20 W G M *hrasvânt.* 21 W *iti 'ty.*

आकारेकारोकाराः सिषिपराः पदान्तयोः ॥ १४ ॥

14 The vowels *â*, *î*, and *û* have *anusvâra*, when they are followed by *si* or *shi* final

This rule, of course, applies to the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural of neuters in *as*, *is*, and *us* The illustrative examples are *vayâṅsi pakvagandhena* (v 7 23), *tamâṅsi gûhatâm ayushṭâ* (i 8 22⁵ only O has *ayushṭâ*), *daça havîṅshi* (vii 5 14²), *jyotîṅshi kurute* (v 4 1⁴ O omits), *agna âyûṅshi* (i 3 14⁷ et al), and *avabhṛthayajûṅshi juhoti* (vi 6 3¹ G M omit *juhoti*) To show that the *si* or *shi* must be final, are quoted *tasmâd vâsishṭho brahmâ* (iii 5 2¹ only G M have *brahmâ*), and *manîshino manasâ* (iv 6 2⁵ O omits *manasâ*) To show that the preceding vowel must be long, we have *yathâ 'nasi yukta âdhîyate* (v 4 10² only G M have the last word), *jyotis tvâ jyotishi* (i 1 10³), and *âyushi durone* (i 2 14³), and, finally, to show that no other vowel than *i* after the *s* or *sh* calls out the increment, *prayâsv eva prayâtâsu* (vi 4 1³), *oshadhîshu* (iii 5 5² et al), and *tanûshu buddham* (i 8 22⁵)

The last six counter-examples are omitted in O, which adds at the end the obvious remark that, as *si* and *shi* are here indicated as occasions of the preceding *anusvâra*, that value no longer belongs to *s* merely—that is to say, the force of the heading given in rule 1 is henceforth at an end

विकृते ऽपि ॥ १५ ॥

15 Even when the *i* is altered

That the *i* of the ending *si* or *shi* is here aimed at is in the nature of the case obvious enough, but not at all distinctly intimated by the terms of the rule The commentator quotes in illustration *chandâṅsy upa dadhâti* (v 3 8¹˒²), *havîṅshy â sâdayet* (i 6 10³), and *tapûṅshy agne juhvâ* (i 2 14¹ G M omit *juhvâ*)

---

14 *sishiparâ âkârekârokârâs tayoh sishyoh padântayoh sator anusvârâgamam bhajante*[1] *yathâ*[2] *vay-* ---- *tam-* ---- *daça* ---- [3]*jyot-* ---- [3] *agna-* ---- *avabh-* ---- *padântayor*[4] *iti kim tasmâd-* ---- *manî-* ---- [5]*âkârekârokârâ iti dîrghena*[5] *kim yathâ-* ---- *jyotis-* ---- *âyushi-* ---- *sishî 'ty*[6] *atre 'kârena kim praj-* ---- *osh-* ---- *tan-* ---- [7]

[1] MSS *jate* [2] O om [(3)] O om [4] O *-ta* [(5)] G M *dirghaih*, O om with all that follows [6] W B *ity* [7] O adds *sishiparanimittayor nideçât sakârasya paranimittatva bhati*

15 *apiçabdânvâdishte*[1] *sishyor ikâre vikṛte 'pi yakâram âpanne 'pi bhavaty anusvârâgamah yathâ*[2] *chand-* ---- *hav-* ---- *tap-* ----

[1] W B O *-bdonv-*, G M *bdenâ 'nv-* [2] G M O om

अनाकारो ह्रस्वः सांकृत्यस्य ॥ १६ ॥

16 According to Sâmkrtya, the vowel, except *â*, is short

That is to say, the two vowels *î* and *û*, to which alone reference has been made above, become short in the cases here referred to for example, in *havînshi bhavanti* (v 5 1[7] et al O omits *bhavanti*) and *samishtayajûnshi juhoti* (vi 6 2[1] G M O omit *juhoti*), where Sâmkrtya would read *havinshi* and *yajunshi*, while in *vayânsi* (v 7 23 et al O omits) he would admit the long vowel

A curious case of dissent upon a point in grammar which we have not been accustomed to regard as open to any difference of opinion The rule is, naturally enough, pronounced unapproved

G M add *ca* to the rule, after *sâmkrtyasya*

न पदे द्विस्वरे नित्यम् ॥ १७ ॥

17 Not, under any circumstances, in a dissyllabic word

This is a rule prescribing exceptions under rule 14, the addition *nityam*, 'under any circumstances,' confirms its application to words ending in *si* or *shi* after *â*, *î*, or *û* which would otherwise fall under any other rule prescribing the increment

Examples under rule 14 alone are first quoted, namely *stuto yâsi vaçân anu* (i 8 5[1] G M O end with *yâsi*) and *yâsi dûtah* (iii 5 5[3] G M have dropped out *yâsi*) Then, as a case also under rule 2, we have *vidhatah pâsi nu tmanâ* (i 3 14[1]), and, as one under rule 8, *prathame mâsi prshthâni* (vii 5 3[1] G M omit the last word), which has been already made the subject of discussion under rule 12, above The force of the *nityam* does not go so far as to prohibit an *anusvâra* in every dissyllabic word before *si*, what-

---

16 *âkârâd anyo 'nâkârah îkâra ûkâraç ce 'ty arthah tayor eva prakrtatvât sâmkrtyasya mata îkâra ûkâraç ca hrasvam âpadyate yathâ*[1] *hav-----* *sam-----* [2]*anâkâra iti kim vayânsi*[2]

ne 'dam sûtram ishtam

[1] O om [(2)] O om

17 *dvisvare*[1] *pade vartamânâ*[2] *âkârekârokârâh*[3] *padântasishi-parâ*[4] *nâ*[5] *'nusvârâgamam*[6] *bhajante yathâ*[7] *stuto----* [8]*yâsi ----* *nityaçabdah prâptyantarapratishedhârthah vidhatah ----*[8] [9]*sraçoha*[10] (xvi 2) *iti prâptih prathame----* *mâ pa-dâdir*[11] (xvi 8) *iti prâptih dvâu svarâu yasmin*[12] *vidyete tad dvisvaram tasmin*[9]

[1] O *dvitvasv-* [2] G M *-na* [3] G M *âkârah îkârah*, O *âkâraûkarâh* [4] G M *ntas sishpairo*, O *ntâ si* [5] B om, G M *nityan nâ* [6] B ins *na*, O ins *nityam* [7] G M O om [(8)] W om [(9)] B om [10] O *hapâça padâdaya*, [11] O *dvir yâs* [12] G M ins *pade*

ever vowel precedes, or it would include *hañsi* also, and possibly other cases

ऋजीषिजिगासिजिघास्यजासियजासिददासिदधासिवर्तयासि च ॥ १८ ॥

18 Nor in *rjîshi*, *jigâsi*, *jighâsi*, *ajâsi*, *yajâsi*, *dadâsi*, *dadhâsi*, and *vartayâsi*

These are verbal forms which need to be excepted under rule 14, and which, as containing more than two syllables, are not reached by rule 17 The passages in which they occur are quoted by the commentary, as follows *tena rjîshi sarvâni* (iii 2 2[1] only O has *sarvâni*), *achâ jigâsi* (iv 2 4[2]), *â tvam ajâsi garbhadham* (vii 4 19[1]), *havishâ yajâsy agne brhat* (iii 5 11[2] et al O omits the last two words), *yâbhir dadâsi dâçushe* (iii 3 11[5] G M omit *dâçushe*), *dadhâsi dâçushe kave* (iv 2 7[2]), and *açvam â vartayâsi nah* (vii 4 20) *Yajâsi* I have noted in two or three other passages, if the rest occur elsewhere, I have overlooked them This leaves unaccounted for *jighâsi*, which is declared to occur "in another text," in the passage *prathame jighâsi*

दꣳसनाभ्योदꣳसोभिर्दꣳसंवृषदꣳशोदꣳशुकादꣳष्ट्राभ्यां परः ॥ १९ ॥

19 In *dañsanâbhyah*, *dañsobhih*, *dañsam*, *vrshadañçah*, *dañçukâ*, and *dañshtrâbhyâm*, *anusvâra* is taken in the latter place

The commentator's citations are *vâiçvânarasya dañsanâbhyah* (i 5 11[1]), *sajoshâv açvinâ dañsobhih* (v 6 4[1]), to which is added as counter-example, proving the need of the *-bhih*, *yushmâko 'tî riçâdasah* (iv 3 13[3] O has only the last word, and G M begin

---

18 [1] *cakâro nishedhâkarshakah rjîshiprabhrtishu*[2] *grahaneshu*[3] *nâ 'nusvârâgamah syât âkâre ekârokârâ â* (xvi 14) *iti prâptih bahusvaratvâd*[4] *eshu*[5] *pûrvasûtranishedo*[6] *na sidhyatî 'ty atrâ*[7] *'yam ârambhah yathâ*[8] *tena.... achâ.... jighâsî*[9] *'ti çâkhântare* [10]*prathame jighâsî 'ti*[10] *â.... havishâ ... yâbhir.... dadhâsi.... açvam....*

[1] O ins an enumeration of the words in the rule [2] G M *-rti* [3] O om [4] G M *radi* [5] B *esha*, G M om [6] G M *-tre ni*, W B *dhân* [7] O om *atra* [8] G M O om [9] G M *ânsi* (10) O om, W *prathame* — — — (as being illegible in the MS from which the copy was made), B *-ghâsati*

19 [1] *dañsanâbhya ityâdishu*[2] *grahaneshu para evâ 'nusvârâgamo bhavati*[3] *yathâ*[4] *vâiçv-.... saj-.... bhir iti kim yushm-....* [5] *purud-.... vrsh-.... paçûn.... dañsh-.... dañse 'ty etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam kim akhilapadapâthena*[6] *kur-*

with *ûti*), *prauḍañsañ sanim* (iv 2 4[3]), *vrshadañças te dhâtuh* (v 5 12) there is another case at v 5 21, *paçûn dañçukâh syur yad vishûcînam* (v 2 9[6] O omits the first word, and it alone has the last two), and *dañshtrâbhyâm malimlûn* (iv 1 10[2]) there is another case at v 7 11 To the objection that the citation in the rule of *dañsa* simply might have saved the rehearsal of whole words [in a part of the cases given], the commentator replies by quoting *kurvato me mo 'pa dasat* (i 6 3[3] et al) as an example of cases which need to be excluded The addition of *parah*, 'in the latter place,' is because *vrshadañçah* contains two places at which, by xv 4, the *anusvâra* would otherwise require to be inserted

This last point, however, does not pass (except in O) without farther question and discussion The objection is raised that the mere citation of *vrshadañça* without *anusvâra* before the former sibilant is enough to settle its reading, according to the same principle that was appealed to under rule 13, for *hrasîyâ*, *vasîyâ*, and so on This is undeniable, and the only real answer to be made is that there was no harm in adding *para* here, to make the matter sure, while it could not have been employed in rule 13 without occasioning a great deal of additional trouble The commentator, however, prefers to have recourse to a plea of exceptionally puerile character In xv 4 (the rule here in force), he says, the spirants in general are implied, but in xvi 1 (in force at rule 13) a special spirant, *s*, and it is an acknowledged principle that, as between a generality and a specification, the specification is the more powerful That being the case, the putting down of that

---

vato .... *ityâdâu mâ bhûd iti 'para iti kim vrshadañça ity atra*[8] *sthânadvaye 'pi srâdishu câi 'kapada* (xv 4) *iti prâptâu satyâm pûrvatra*[9] *mâ bhûd iti nanu grahanasâmarthyâd evâ 'nusvârah*[10] *pûrvatra na bhavati yathâ hrasîyâ vasîyâ* (xvi 13) *ityâdâu grahanasâmarthyâd*[11] *upapâditam nâi 'sha doshah srâdishu câi 'kapada* (xv 4) *ity atro 'shmasâmânyam uktam atha sakâraparâ* (xvi 1) *ity atra tu tadviçesha uktah sâmânyaviçeshayor viçesho balavân iti nyâyah tathâ sati* [12]*balavadbâdhanam*[13] *eva bhûshanam* [14]*na tu*[14] *durbalabâdhanam*[15] *iti*[12] *tatrâi 'va grahanasâmarthyam*[16] *samarthanîyam na tv atra*[17] *durbalasthâne tathâ 'pi*[18] [19] *adhikah*[20] *purusho virodhinam*[21] *adhikam eva bâdhate bhûshanatvât na tu kadâcid alpabalam*[22] *iti*[23] *paraçabdaprayoga*[24] *upapadyate*

[1] O prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule [2] G M *di* [3] G M *syat* [4] in W only [5] O ins *ity atra 'py akuradi* (i 2) *iti vacanad anusvaragamah syat tan ma bhud iti* [6] G M *-thanena* [7] O om [8] W *ava* [9] W *-rva* [10] B *ragamah* [11] W *samarthyagrahanam* [12] W *balavatiyam eva bhushanam vâdhanam eva bhushanam na tu durbalam iti bâdhana* [13] G M *-vatsadh*, B *-dham* [14] G M om [15] G M *-lasadhanam na sadhv* [16] W *nam eva samarthyam*, B *-rthya* [17] B *artha* [18] G M *hi* [19] G M ins *loke* [20] W *adh*, G M *ka* [21] W *-dhanam* [22] W B *apy alpam* [23] B *iti 'ti* [24] W B *atra çabd*

which is powerful, not of that which is weak, is honorific, hence, the competency of the citation was to be insisted on in the former rule, but not here, in a weak position Moreover, a superior man puts down, for honor's sake, a mighty opponent, but never a weak one Therefore, the use of the word *para* here is right and proper!

All the MSS except B (and G M, which have a slight *lacuna*, involving the word) read *dañsan* instead of *dañsam* in the rule

मंꣳस्येमंꣳसतैयंꣳसद्यंꣳसन्वंꣳसतेवंꣳसगः ॥ २० ॥

20 Also in *mañsye*, *mañsatâi*, *yañsad*, *yañsan*, *vañsate*, and *vañsagah*

The commentator quotes as follows *paçûn nâ 'bhi mañsya iti* (iii 1 9[6]), *anu nâu çûra mañsatâi bhadrâ indrasya râtayah* (vii 4 15 O alone has the first two words, B alone the last one), *çocishâ yañsad viçvam ny atrinam* (iv 6 1[5] G M O omit *çocishâ*), *ishavah çarma yañsan* (iv 6 6[4]), *agnir no vañsate rayim* (iv 6 1[5]), and *tigmaçrñgo na vañsagah* (ii 6 11[4]) The words here dealt with occur only in the passages quoted, except *yañsat*, which is found also at iv 1 11[2], 7 14[3] To the objection that it would have been enough to give *mañs*, *yañs*, and *vañs* (the MSS leave it doubtful whether these are the precise forms suggested) in the rule, instead of citing whole words, the commentator replies by giving the counter examples *uttamasyâ 'va dyati* (vi 3 10[4]), *yasya bhûyâñso yajñakratavah* (iii 1 7[3]), and *adya vasu vasati* (ii 5 3[7])

उन्न वंꣳशम् ॥ २१ ॥

21 Also in *vañçam*, after *ut* or *na*

The passages are *ud vañçam iva yemire* (i 6 12[3] W has dropped out *yemire*, along with all the rest of the comment) and *prâcînavañçam karoti* (vi 1 1[1] twice) A counter-example, with a different preceding word, is *brahmavarcasy eva bhavati vaçam vâ esha carati* (ii 1 7[7] only O has the first two words, and it omits the last two)

---

20 [1] *mañsya ityâdishu*[2] *syâd anusvâra âgamah yathâ*[3] *paçûn* ---- *anu*--- *çoc*-.... *ishavah*---- *agnir*---- *tigm*- ---- [4]*mañs yañs vañs* [4] *ity etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam kim akhila-padapâthena utt*-.... *yasya*---- *adya*---- *ityâdâu mâ bhûd iti*

[1] O prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule [2] B *-di* [3] G M O om [(4)] W *bhadrayañ*, B *samsur yams vams* G M *mamsa yamsa vamsa*, O *mañse yañse vañse*

21 *ut*[1] *na ity evampûrve*[2] *vañçam ity asmin grahane syâd anusvârâgamah ud*---- [3]*prâ*- -- [4]*evampûrva iti*[4] *kim brahm*-.... [3]

[1] O *uñsyatebhrat* [2] W *rvo*, B *rva* [(3)] W om [(4)] O *unne 'ti*

अक्रंस्ताक्रंस्यतेरंस्यतेभ्रंशते ॥ २२ ॥

22 Also in *akrañsta*, *krañsyate*, *rañsyate*, and *bhrañçate*

The passages are *dyâm vâjy â 'krañsta* (vii 5 19[1]), *utkrañsyate svâhâ* (vii 1 19[3]), *uparañsyate svâhâ* (vii 1 19[1] B O omit), and *nâ 'smâd râshtram bhrañçate* (v 7 4[4] O omits the first two words), *bhrañçate* occurs also at i 6 11[1] twice

G M read *utkrañsyate* for *krañsyate* in the rule

रंह्यै च ॥ २३ ॥

23 And also in *rañhyâi*

The only passage is *pûshno rañhyâi* (i 3 10[2]) The significance of the *ca*, 'and,' which is here out of its proper place, will be given, we are told, under the next rule

ऐकार उख्यस्य नितान्तः ॥ २४ ॥

24 The *âi*, according to Ukhya, is excessive

That is to say, according to the commentator, the *âi* of the word *rañhyâi*, here brought forward by the *ca*, 'and,' which is read in the preceding rule *Nitânta*, 'excessive,' is explained as signifying 'uttered with more violent effort' The whole business is a very queer one—Ukhya's opinion itself, its introduction here at a place where it is entirely impertinent, and the bit of interpretation whereby it is worked into the connection

विरित्रि संख्यासु ॥ २५ ॥

25 Also in *vi*, *ri*, and *tri*, in numerals, except in *su*

---

22 [1]*akrañste 'tyâdishu syâd anusvârâgamah*[1] *dyâm---- utkr----* [2]*upa- ---*[2] *nâ----*

(1) O substitutes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule (except the last), and *eteshu grahaneshv anusvarâgamo bhavati* (2) B O om

23 *rañhyâ ity asmin grahane syâd anusvârâgamah pûshno ---- cakârasya* [1]*vyatihârenâ 'nvaya*[1] *uttarasûtre prayojanam ucyate*

(1) G M *vyavaharâd anvayâd*

24 *rañhyâ ity asmin*[1] *grahane pûrvasûtrasthacakârasamarpita*[2] *âikâro nitânto bhavatî 'ty*[3] *ukhyasya*[4] *mate*[5] *nitântas tîvrataraprayatna ity arthah*

nâi 'tan matam ishtam

[1] G M om [2] B *-trasya cak-*, O *-treprayosthacak* , G M *pite* [3] G M om *iti* [4] W *ukhya*, O *ukhyasyâ 'caryasya* [5] O *tam*

The syllable *su* is here, the commentator tells us, the ending of the locative case, just as *ah* (at i 23) is used as representing the nominative case This remark is called for, because (see the example below) the actual form in which the syllable appears in the cases aimed at is *shu* We have a right to be surprised at finding it given as *su* in the rule, and perhaps, also, to conjecture that *samkhyâsu* was originally simply the locative plural of *samkhyâ*, and that the other value was interpreted into it when the cases calling for exception were noticed

The quoted examples are *viñçatyâi svâhâ* (vii 2 13 et al O omits), *yad viñçatir dve tena virâjâu* (v 3 3[3] G M omit the last two words, O the last three), *catvâriñçate svâhâ* (vii 2 17 G M O omit *svâhâ*, B has dropped out *-te svâhâ*, the next example, and the first word of the next but one), *triñçate svâhâ* (vii 2 17 O omits *svâhâ*), and *triñçat trayaç ca* (i 4 11[1]), there are other cases, which I have not taken the trouble to collect The inclusion of *tri* in the rule, the commentator says, is for the sake of greater plainness, since *ri*, of course, involves *tri* also, it is to be compared with the inclusion of the *v* of *vâghâ* in rule vii 13 Begging the commentator's pardon, however, the two cases are not at all analogous, and the citation of *tri* and *ri* together must be esteemed an oversight, and an offense against the law of economy of expression, obligatory in the *sûtra*-style The need of restriction to numerals is illustrated by *viçe janâya* (ii 5 12[3]), *sa rishah pâtu naktam* (i 2 14[7] et al G M O omit *naktam*), and *trishtubhâi 'vâ 'smâi* (ii 5 10[1] et al) Finally, the specification "not before *su*" is established by *trishv â rocane divah* (iv 2 4[4] et al O omits *divah*), if there is another case of this kind, I have failed to note it

There is yet another word, *trishâhasrah* (v 6 8[3], p *tri-sâhasrah*), which would properly fall under this rule, but is exempted by a pregnant interpretation of the word *ekapade* in xv 4 (see the note to that rule)

शिꣳशुमारः शिꣳषत्सꣳश्वासꣳस्वासꣳसृष्टसꣳस्कृत्यसꣳस्कृ-तसꣳशितसꣳशिताकिꣳशिलकिꣳशिला ॥ २६ ॥

---

25 *vi ri tri* [1] *evampûrva ûshmaparo*[2] *'nusvârâgamah*[3] *syât ebhir yadi*[4] *samkhyo 'cyate*[5] *asu*[6] *suçabdam varjayitvâ su*[7] *saptamî vibhaktir uktâ yathâ 'hkârah*[8] *prathamâvibhaktyupalakshanam*[9] *viñ-.... yad.... catv-....*[10] *triñ-....*[10] *triñçat.... trigrahanam vispashtârtham yato*[11] *viri samkhyâ 'sv ity*[12] *etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam yathâ vâghâshapurva* (vii 13) *ity atra vakâro vispashtârthah samkhye 'ti kim viçe... sa.... trisht-.... asv iti kim trishv....*

[1] G M O ins *ity* [2] B *ukarap-* [3] G M *-ra âg-* [4] G M *yadâ* [5] O *'cyeta* [6] W *a* [7] G M *sv iti*, O *su iti* [8] B *ak-*, G M *âk-* [9] O *-kter up-* [10] B om [11] G M om [12] O om

26 Also in *çiñçumârah*, *çiñshat*, *sañsvâ*, *sañsrâ*, *sañsrshta*, *sañskrtya*, *sañskrta*, *sañçita*, *sañçitâ*, *kiñçila*, and *kiñçilâ*

The passages, as quoted, are *sindhoh çiñçumâro himavatah* (v 5 11 only O has the last word), *kim tata uc chiñshatî 'ti yad dhvanyeshtakâh* (v 5 5[2] only O has the last two words, and it omits the first two), *ubhayatahsañçvâyi kuryâd avadâyâ 'bhi* (ii 6 8[4] only O has the last two words, and it leaves off *ubhayatah*), *sañsrâvabhâgâ stha* (i 1 13[2]), *sañsrshtajit somapâh* (iv 6 4[1] W B put this after the next following example, see farther on), *çarîram eva sañskrtyâ 'bhyârohati* (v 6 6[3 4] O omits the first two words, and all but O omit the last one, thus making a citation which is also found again in v 6 6[4]), *tan nah sañskrtam* (i 4 43[2]), *brahmasañçito hy esha ghrtâhavanah* (ii 5 9[2] only O has the last word), *çaravye brahmasañçitâ* (iv 6 4[4]), *kiñçila vanya yâ ta ishuh* (v 5 9[1] all but G M end with *te*), and *kiñçilaç caturtho vanyah* (v 5 9[2] G M alone have *vanyah*) and *kiñçilâya ca kshayanâya ca* (iv 5 9[1] O ends with the first *ca*) The commentary prefaces the last two passages with the remark that the second citation of *kiñçila* is that of a part of a word, including a variety of cases But this, in the first place, would imply that the reading of the rule at the end was *kiñçilakiñçila* which is the case only in T , and, in the second place, even were that the reading, the explanation would be a bad one, and the repeated *kiñçila* should be defined as a theme ending in *a*, and so including the declensional forms of that theme, by i 22 in fact, it was expressly cited under that rule, as an example of its application If *kiñçilâ* is the true reading (as I presume to be the case), then we must suppose that the makers of the rule intended both words as *padâikadeça*'s, the one involving the first two examples quoted, the other the third, and the case being quite parallel with that of *sañçita* and *sañçitâ*, just preceding but the comment has discovered a difficulty, namely, that *kiñçila* is actually a *pada* in the text (v 5 9[1]), and therefore cannot be quoted without ceremony as a *padâikadeça* (see under rule 29, where this is more distinctly brought out), and hence its efforts to amend the reading and interpretation—efforts in which it is too intent upon the end to be gained to be mindful of consistency in the means employed In short, here as in many other places, the Prâtiçâkhya is less minutely accurate in its modes of statement than the commentator would fain have it, and he undertakes to make it what it should be by forced interpretation

---

26 [1] *çiñçumâra ityâdigrahaneshu*[2] *syâd anusvârâgamah yathâ*[3] *sindhoh---- kim---- ubhay----- sañsr----- sañsr----- çarî----- tan---- brahm-----* [4] *çar----- kiñç----- parakiñçilagrahanam*[5] *padâikadeçatayâ bahûpâdânârtham kiñçilaç---- kiñçilâya---- nanu*[6] *sañsrshte 'ty atra shakâraparo 'nusvârâgamah kim na syât mâi 'vam atra sûtre sarvatra*[7] *padâdivarnânantaram*[8] *evâ 'nusvâradarçanât tatsâha-*

Cases of various character are here intermingled The first two and the last are indivisible words, of which the *anusvâra* forms an essential part, as of those cited in rules 19 and 20, or 29 and 30 The others come from combinations with the preposition *sam*, and are of two classes *san̆skṛtya* and *san̆skṛta* the *pada*-text does not attempt to analyze, although (see v 6,7) it divides *san̆skurute* and *samaskurvata*, ejecting the intrusive sibilant those remaining are compounds with *sam* which enter into further composition, so that their compound character does not appear in the *pada*-text And one or two cases of this last class seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise they are *svâdushan̆sadah* (iv 6 6³, p *svâdu sansadah*) and *strîshan̆sâdam* (ii 5 1⁵, p *strî-sansâdam*) The former of them, indeed, is noticed in G M, which introduce *san̆sadah* into the rule, after *san̆skṛta*, and quote the compound in the comment—seeming to betray their consciousness that the word is not a part of the ordinary reading of the rule by saying "when *san̆sadah* is read, the instance is *svâdushan̆sadah*"

There are further varieties of reading in the rule G M have *çin̆shati*, W B put *san̆sṛshta* between *san̆skṛtya* and *san̆skṛta*, and give its example a corresponding place among the examples, T B G M read *san̆skṛtan̆*, which is perhaps to be preferred, other differences are mere copyists' errors, and not worth reporting

So far as I have discovered, *san̆skṛtam* (i 2 9) and *san̆çita* (iv 6 4⁴ a second time) are the only words included in this rule which occur further in the Sanhitâ

The commentator raises the question whether we must not suppose that an *anusvâra* is also to be inserted before the spirant *sh* in *san̆sṛshta*, but, without this time appealing to the "competency of the citation" to settle the reading, replies that, the word being associated here with others all of which have *anusvâra* only after the first vowel, we must assume the same to be the case with it also, all but O adding that "there is no reason for inconsistency" in this respect

सितृदृ ह्कारपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27 Also after *si*, *tṛ*, or *dṛ*, when *h* follows

The quoted examples are *sin̆ho vayah* (iv 3 5), *çatatarhân̆s tṛn̆hanti* (i 5 7⁶ et al), and *dṛn̆hasva mâ hvâh* (i 1 3 et al) Of the

---

caryâd[9] *atrâ 'pi tathâi 'va*[10] *vijñeyam* [11]*na vâiparîtye kâranam asti*[11]

[1] O prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words cited in the rule [2] G M *dishu gr*, O *-dishu* [3] G M O om [4] G M ins *sansada iti pâthe svâdushansadah* [5] W *param ki-* [6] G M om [7] W G M *sarva* [8] W *varn*, G M *-nâñcaram* [9] O *sâh-* [10] B *'vâ 'pi* [(11)] O om, W om *na*

27 *si tṛ dṛ ity evampûrvo hakâraparah*[1] *syâd anusvârâgamah*[2] *yathâ*[3] *sin̆ho.... çatat-.... dṛn̆h-....* [4]*evam-*

noun *sinha*, and of forms from the roots *trnh* and *drnh*, which alone come under the action of the rule, there are other cases in the Sanhitâ Counter-examples are given (excepting in O) to show that no other syllables take the increment before *h*, *sapatnasâhî svâhâ* (i 2 12² but G M substitute *sapatnasâhîn sam mârjmi*, i 1 10¹) and *anatidâhâyo 'vâca* (v 2 10³), that *r* takes the increment only when preceded by *t* or *d*, *grhânâm asamartyâi* (iii 3 8²), that the increment is taken only before *h*, *sishâsantîh* (vii 5 2¹ G M read *sishâsah*, but doubtless by a blunder only), *trshvîm anu* (i 2 14¹), and *naktam drçe dîpyate* (v 6 4⁴)

मंहिष्ठस्य च ॥ २८ ॥

28 As also, in *manhishthasya*

That is to say, before the *h*, which is brought down from the preceding rule by *ca*, expressly in order to exclude the assumption of *anusvâra* before the *sh* and *s* in the same word The passage is *manhishthasya prabhrtasya* (iv 2 3⁴), and there is no other

आदिरंहतिरंहोऽंहोरंहोमुगत्यंहाअंहसोऽंह-साऽंशमंशुभिरंशभुवांश्वंशूअंशवोऽंशुरंशुमंशू-नंशुनांशोरंशायोपांश्वंशौ ॥ २९ ॥

29 Also, after the first vowel, in *anhatih*, *anhah*, *anhoh*, *an homuc*, *atyanhâh*, *anhasah*, *anhasâ*, *ançam*, *ançubhih*, *ançabhuvâ*, *ançu*, *ançû*, *ançavah*, *ançuh*, *ançum*, *ançûn*, *ançunâ*, *ançoh*, *an çâya*, *upânçu*, and *ançâu*

We have here a detailed list of complete *padas* (or, in one or two instances, more than a whole *pada*), in which *anusvâra* is found The illustrative examples are as follows For *anhatih*, *pari dveshaso anhatih* (ii 6 11²) the only case For *anhah*, *anhomucam vrshabham yajñiyânâm* (i 6 12⁴, p *anhah-mucam* G M O omit the last word), *anhah* is found four or five times in the Sanhitâ as an independent word, and about fifteen times in the

---

pûrva iti kim sap-.... anati-.... rkârenâi 'vâ[5] *'lam kim takâradakârâbhyâm grh-.... evampura iti kim sish-.... trshvîm.... naktam* .[4] *hakârah paro yasmâd* [6]*asâu hakâraparah*[6]

[1] G M *raç ca* [2] O *asau hekaraparah* [3] B G M O om [(4)] O om [5] G M om *eva* [6] G M *sa tathoktah*

28 *manhishthasye 'ty asmin grahane cakârâkrshtahakârapare 'nusvârâgamo bhavati*[1] *yathâ*[2] *manh-....* [3]*cakârah kimarthah atrâi 'va grahane sashakârapare mâ bhûd iti*[3]

[1] G M O *syât* [2] G M O om [(3)] O om

compound *an̆homuc*—one of the forms of which, as we shall see farther on, has to be made separate account of. For *an̆hoh*, *an̆hoç cid yâ* (i 4 22 and ii 1 11[4]) there is no other case. For *an̆homuk*, *an̆homugbhyâm dvikapâlah* (vii 5 22. O omits *dvikapâlah*, and W. B. put it in out of place), of all the forms of *an̆homuc*, this is the only one in which *an̆hah* does not form a *pada* (it is divided, of course, *an̆homuk-bhyâm*), and which therefore is not disposed of by the citation of *an̆hah*. For *atyan̆hâh*, *rtapâç cà 'tyan̆hâh* (i 8 13[2,3]) the word is found again at iv 6 5[5], it is more than a simple *pada* (p. *ati-an̆hâh*), and the *ati* is included in the citation, we are told, to prevent confusion of *an̆hâh* with *ahâh* in such phrases as *shaḍahâ bhavanti* (vii 5 1[4], *shaṭ-ahâh*). For *an̆hasah*, *te no mun̄catam an̆hasah* (iv 7 15[6]. all except B. read *mun̄cantv*, which does not occur before *an̆hasah*) of this case of *an̆has* I have noted about twenty instances. For *an̆hasâ*, the only example is the one quoted, *an̆hasâ vâ esha grhîtah* (ii 4 2[3]. O ends with *vâi*). The commentator next raises the question why whole *padas* should have been cited, when *an̆ha* (as part of a word) would have been sufficient to assure the reading, and replies by quoting *sa rasam aha vasantâya* (vii.2 10[1]. O begins with *aha*), as an example of cases that required to be excluded. For *an̆çum*, *pari paçyâmo 'n̆çam â* (vii 1 6[2]. O omits *â*) the form is found again in the same division. For *an̆çubhih*, *shaḍbhir an̆çubhih pavayati* (vi 4 5[7]. O omits *yavayati*, W. B. put this example off until after that for *an̆çu*, which would be, to be sure, a more suitable place for it, if the same order were followed in the rule, but there all authorities agree: see further on). For *an̆çabhuvâ*, *tvayâ 'n̆çabhuvâ somam* (vi 4 8[2]. G. M. O. omit *somam*) the word is found again at vi 4 8[3]. For *an̆çu*, *tenâ 'n̆çumat* (iii 2 2[1]), and it is pointed out that, by rule i 53 (the comment blunderingly quotes i 52 instead), *anan̆çu kurvantah* (iii 2 2[1]) is involved with *an̆çu* (O has lost, of this, all but the example *anan̆çu ku*). For *an̆çû*, *vrshno hy etâv an̆çû* (vi 4 5[3]). For *an̆çavah*, *prânâ vâ an̆çavah* (vi 4 4[4]). For *an̆çuh*, *an̆çur*, *an̆çus te* (i 2 11[1] et al.) the word is found in eight other passages. For *an̆çum*, *yam âdityâ an̆çum âpyâyayanti* (ii 3 5[3] et al. only W. has the last word) there are five other instances. For *an̆çûn*, *an̆çûn apa grhnâti* (vi 4 4[4]. lost in W.) it occurs further in the

---

29. [1] *an̆hatih* ...... *eteshv âdâu*[2] *anusvârâgamo*[3] *'bhavati*[4] *yathâ*[5] *pari* .... *an̆ho* .... [6]*sûtre samhitâyâm otvavidhânâd*[7] *ahar* .... *ityâdâu na syâd ayam vidhih kintu yasmin visarjanîyo repham nâ* [7]*'padyate tasyâi 'vo 'pâdânam*[6] *an̆hoç* .... [8] [9]*nanv ayam*[10] *câi*[11] *'kabandhah rephaprâptasyâ*[12] *'yam vidhih vihitânusvârasyâi 'va*[13] *rephanishedhate*[14] *'ti nâ 'yam doshah siddhasyâi 'vâ* [15,7]*'nusvârasya bodhanam*[16] *na tu vidhir iti*[17] *an̆hom-* .... [15,9] *rtap-* .... *atî 'ti kim shaḍ-* .... *te* .... *an̆hasâ* .... [18]*an̆he 'ty*[18] *etâvatâ*[19] *siddhe*[20] *sakalapadapâṭhah kimarthah*[21] *sa rasam* .... *iti*[22] *nishedhârthaḥ pari* ... [23]*shaḍ-*

same division, and in no other. For *añçunâ*, *añçunâ te añçuḥ* (i. 2. 6: G. M. O. end with *te*). For *añçoḥ*, *yo vâ añçor âyatanaṁ veda* (vi. 6. 10²: O. omits the last two words, and B. has lost the whole example, with most of the preceding one). For *añçâya*, *añçâya svâhâ bhagâya* (i. 8. 13³: G. M. omit *bhagâya*). For *upâñçu*, *upâñçusavano yad upâñçusavanam* (vi. 4. 4¹: O. omits the first two words). The word *upâñçu*, when not further compounded, is separated in *pada*-text into *upa-añçu*, and so most of its forms come under the various citations of the cases of *añçu* already illustrated (thus, it furnishes additional instances, not counted above, to *añçu*, *añçuḥ*, *añçum*, and *añçoḥ*, twenty in all); but in its compounds it makes, of course, a single *pada* of itself (thus, *upâñçu-savanaḥ*), and so has to be cited in the rule as such (we have other combinations, namely, with *pâtra*, *yâja*, and *antaryâma*); and, moreover, we have one case, *upâñçâu*, showing a form of *añçu* which does not appear independently, and so furnishing the final citation, for which the example is *tam upâñçâu sam asthâpayan* (vi. 4. 6¹): there is another in the same division.

The restriction *âdiḥ*, 'after the first vowel,' is intended to guard against any one's imagining that the *s* of *añhasaḥ* and so on is to be preceded by *anusvâra*.

What has thus been given represents the whole comment as found in O.; the other MSS. make two or three troublesome additions, to which it is necessary to return. The last of them regards the citation of *añçu* and its inflectional forms (namely, those that contain *añçu* as a part, or *añçubhiḥ*, *añçuḥ*, *añçum*, *añçunâ*); and, if I understand it aright, it asserts that, if *añçu* alone were cited, the other forms would not be included, because *añçu* itself occurs as a *pada* (and would therefore have to be taken as such, and not as a part of a word, *padâikadeça*); and if it be proposed to cite it with each value, as was done with *kiñçila* (in rule 26: see note to that rule), there remains the difficulty that, as a phonetic complex only, it would involve such cases as *paçum paçupate te adya* (iii. 1. 4¹: W. omits *paçum*)—where, namely, we have the same elements in combination, only without the *anusvâra*. With regard to *añça*, a somewhat similar statement appears to be made: namely, that if *añça* simply were quoted, it would be understood as a *pada* (being such in *añça-bhuvâ*), and hence *añçam* would

---

. . . .[23] *tvayâ* . . . [24]*bhuve 'ti kim añçe 'ty etâvatâ*[25] *grahaṇe tathâvidhapadasadbhâvâd añçum*[26] *ity atra na*[27] *syât*[24] *tenâ* . . . . [28]*apy akârâdi* (i. 52) *iti vacanâd anañçu* . . . *ity apy*[29] *udâharaṇam*[28] *vṛshṇo* . . . *prâṇâ* . . . . [30]*añçur* . . . .[30] *yam* . . . . [31]*añçûn* . . . .[31] *añçunâ* . . . . *yo* . . . . *añçâya* . . . . *upâñçu* . . . . *tam* . . . . [32]*añçv*[33] *ity*[34] *etâvati*[35] *gṛhîta itareshâm aparigrahaḥ*[36] *syât*[37] *tathâvidhapadasadbhâvât atho 'bhayam gṛhyate padam ekadeçaç*[38] *ca kiñçilavat tathâ sati padâikadeçe-shu paçum* . . . . *ityâdishu prâpnuyâd anusvâraḥ*[39] *tac câ 'nish-*

not be included The comment, however, puts this forward as a reason for including the *bhuvâ* of *ançabhuvâ*, which, according to the interpretation here offered, it would not be, and perhaps my comprehension of the argument is insufficient I do not see any reason why, if the *pada*-text divides *ança-bhuvâ*, the *bhuvâ* should be given in the rule Equally unexplainable to me is the special citation of *ançubhih*, which, being divided in *pada* into *ançu-bhih*, falls under *ançu* we have also in the Sanhita *ançubhyâm* (i 4 2 and vi 4 5³), which is a case analogous with the other, and ought to be treated like it Possibly we may infer from the unsuitable position of *ançubhih* in the rule, and from the place of its example as given in W B, next after that containing *ançu-mat* (as if it were, like the latter, a case of *ançu*), that it has been interpolated, by an awkward and blundering hand, but the conjecture is a more daring one than I venture seriously to make

The first *excursus* of the comment is in connection with the second citation, *añhah* Since the *saṁhitâ*-form of this word, we are told, appears by the rule itself to be *añho*, the rule does not apply to *ahaḥ*, which shows a different result of combination in *ahar devânâm* (i 5 9² G M read *aharahar*, which is not found in the Sanhitâ before *devânâm*), but only to a word the *visarjanîya* of which does not become *r* This seems plausible enough, but what shall we say of the *ahah* which appears in *saṁhitâ* as *aho* in *ahobhyâm*, *ahobhih*, and *ahorâtre* (p *ahah râtre*)? Either the makers of the treatise overlooked these words, or they did not attribute to the form *añho* in the rule the significance which is here claimed for it

The remaining passage is more obscure to me than any of the others In G M, it is both preceded and followed by the examples for *añhoh* and *añhomuk*, in W B, these examples precede it, excepting the last word of the second, which comes after it I imagine that its true place is between the two, and that its intent is to turn against the rule the argument just pleaded respecting *añhah*, pointing out that, as *añhoh* becomes *añhor* in the rule, it ought not to exhibit *anusvâra* except when occurring in that phonetic form the objection being then evaded by the plea that the form is given merely as it happens to occur, and not with any

tam[39] *âdir iti kim sarveshu sthâneshu mâ bhûd iti yathâ*[40] *'ñhasa ityâdi*

[1] O ins *âdih* [2] G M *svarâd* [3] G M *gamam* [4] G M *bhayate* [5] O om [(6)] O om [7] G M *otvasya* [8] MSS ins *añhomugbhyam* [(9)] O om [10] W *aya* [11] G M *ca* [12] W B *ekapr-* [13] G M om *eva* [14] W B *pham ni-* [(15)] W *'nusvarah syat nodhyayana syât tu vidhir iti dvikapâlah*, B *'nusvâra syat bodhyata nanu vidhir iti dvikapalah* [16] G M *udbodhanam* [17] G M *ity anhoç cid ya* [(18)] W *añh*, B *aty* [19] G M *-atih 'va* [20] O *dheh*, B *dheh kutah* [21] W *kim*, B om [22] B *ity atrâ 'pi*, G M *ityâdi*, O *ityâdau* [(23)] W B put next before *apy ukarâdi* [(24)] O om [25] G M *-vad* [26] W B *açum* [27] W B om [(28)] O *anañçu ku* simply [29] W om [(30)] G M put before *vrshno....* [(31)] W om [(32)] O om [33,34] W *añçe 'ty*, G M *ançe 'ty* [35] B *vutâ* [36] B *upaigrha*, G M *api grahanam* [37] G M ins *katham* [38] G M *-deçam* [39] G M *râgamah* [40] W O *a*

intent of prescription But I have too little confidence in the correctness of this conjecture to be led to attempt amending the text into giving it consistent expression

अवग्रह उदात्तो ऽंसेऽंसायांसाभ्यामंसाविति ॥३०॥

30 Also in *añse*, *añsâya*, *añsâbhyâm* and *añsâu*, when accented on the first syllable

The term *avagraha* is declared by the commentator to be equivalent here to *âdi* or *padâdi*, 'beginning of the word' This is, of course, wholly and entirely inadmissible, except as we are driven by the irresistible force of circumstances to give it that meaning or none There has evidently been some blunder committed, but we can hardly venture to attempt its rectification Not one of the words here cited occurs, or could occur, as *avagraha*, 'former member of a compound' The restriction is made with reference to *áñsâu* alone, in order to distinguish it from *asâ'u* The examples are *dakshine 'ñsa upa dadhâti* (v 3 1[5] O omits *dadhâti*, W has lost the whole), *çityañsâya* (vii 3 17 W has lost *çity*), *añsabhyâñ svâhâ* (vii 3 16[2]), and *uttare 'ñsâv eva prati dadhâti* (v 3 1[5] O reads *tishthati* for *dadhâti*, but doubtless by a copyist's error only), the counter-example is *asâv abravîd ṛtravihitâ* (ii 5 2[5] O omits the last word), *añsâbhyâm* alone is found more than once in the text (namely, again at v 7 13)

नासावा नामावा ॥३१॥

31 But not in *asâv â*

There is a single passage where the pronoun *asâu*, in the vocative case, stands at the beginning of a clause, and is, accordingly, accented on the first syllable, hence the necessity of the present rule, establishing an exception under its predecessor The passage is *brûyâ'd ásâv é 'hî' 'ty evám evá* (ii 4 9[3] O alone has *eva*, G M omit also *evam*, and B blunderingly reads instead of it *atra*)

The Prâtiçâkhya's rehearsal of the cases of interior *anusvâra* is,

---

30 *avagraha âdir ity arthah yadi[1] padâdir udâttah syât tarhy añse [2]...... ity eteshu[2] syâd anusvârâgamah itiçabdah svarûpavâcî dakshine.... çity-.... añsâ-.... uttare....' âdir udâtta iti kim asâv....*

[1] B *pari* (2) W om [3] G M *sham*

31 *âdyudâtte[1] saty apy[2] [3]asâv e 'ty[3] asmin [4]grahane na khalu[4] syâd anusvârâgamah brûyâd....*

iti tribhâshyaratne[5] prâtiçâkhyavivarane shodaço[6] 'dhyâyah

[1] W *yady ud*, B *yady udattatve* [2] B O om (3) W *asav ai ty*, B *asau*, G M O *asav ity* (4) O om [5] B *çritri* [6] G M O *dvitiyapraçne caturtho*

so far as I have been able to discover, complete for the present Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, with the exception of the two compounds (*strîshan̆sâda* and *svâdushan̆sad*) noticed under rule 26 Whether its rules are so drawn as to involve no cases that require to be excluded, is a much more difficult question, and one which my examination of the text has not been close enough to enable me to determine, but I have noted no instances of inaccuracy, unless the possible confusion of *an̆hah* and *ahah*, pointed out under rule 29, is to be so considered

CHAPTER XVII

CONTENTS 1–4, opinions of various authorities, as to the degree of nasality in different nasal letters, 5, as to increase of quantity in connection with *anusvara*, 6, as to increased effort required by certain accents, 7–8, as to other more general matters of utterance

तीव्रतरमानुनासिक्यमनुस्वारोत्तमेष्विति शैत्यायनः ॥ १ ॥

1 Çâityâyana says that the nasal quality is stronger in *anusvâra* and the nasal mutes

We have here a chapter entirely composed of the cited opinions of certain specified authorities, and none of them of any definite value or importance in themselves, though interesting as affording us a glimpse of subjects to which the attention of the old Hindu phonetists was drawn, and to their hair-splitting and discordant speculations respecting them

The commentator's exposition adds nothing to our comprehension of the rule It quotes the rule at the end of the second chapter (ii 52) as to the cause of nasal quality, and tries (without good reason) to connect with it the present one Examples of the stronger nasal utterance are given, as follows *agnîn̆r apsushadah*

1 [1]*anusvâraç co 'ttamâç*[2] *câ 'nusvârottamâh teshu tîvrataram bhavaty ânunâsikyam iti çâityâyano nâma munir manyate*[1]. *tîvrâd adhikam tîvrataram anunâsikatâ*[3] *''nunâsikyam nâsikâvivaranâd ânunâsikyam* (ii 52) *ity asya vidheh prayatnadârdhyam*[4] *upadiçyate* [5] *yathâ*[6] *agnîn̆r* . . . . [7]*tân̆s* . . . *martyân̆* . . . .[7] *yam* . . . . [8]*vañcate* . . . . *manina* . . . .[8] *eteshv*[9] *iti kim rukmam* . . . . *tigmam* . . . . [10]*suçl* . . . .[10]

(1) O om [2] W *-maç* [3] W *-sikâ*, B *-sikânâm bhâvah* [4] W O *-dirgham*, B *-dârbyûm*, G M *prâyadârthyam* [5] O ins *anusvârottamâ anunâsikâ ity etâny anunâsikasthânâni anusvârottameshu tîtrataram ânunâsikyam bhavati çâityâyano nama manyate* [6] G M O om (7) in O only (8) O *prân* . . . [9] O *anusvârottameshv* (10) O *sa* . . . *eteshu câi 'va tivrataram*

(v 6 1²), *yam kâmam kâmayate* (vii 1 1² G M O substitute *yam kamayeta*, i 6 10⁴ et al), *vañcate parivañcate* (iv 5 3¹), and *maninâ rûpâṇî 'ndrena* (vii 3 14) , but O introduces after the first *tâṅs te dadhâmi* (iv 1 10³) and *martyâṅ âviveça* (v 7 9¹), and substitutes for the last two *prâṅ prâ 'dravat* (v 7 10¹) Counter-examples, of the weaker utterance, are *rukmam upa dadhâti* (v 2 7² but W substitutes, by an evident blunder, *kûrmam upadadhâti*, v 2 8⁵), *tigmam âyudham* (iv 7 15⁴), and *suçlokâṅ3 sumañgalâṅ3* (i 8 16²), O giving instead of the last *sa imam lokam* (i 5 9⁴), and spoiling the whole illustration by adding, "in these likewise it is stronger " The first two counter-examples are evidently given for the *yama* which, by xxi 12, is to be inserted between the mute and nasal in each the last is a case falling under xv 8, which prescribes nasalization of a protracted final *a* The other nasal sounds are the *nâsikya* (xxi 14), and the nasal semivowels into which *m* and *n* are to be converted (v 26,28) before *l*, *y*, and *v* these last are instanced by the phrase quoted in O alone

The manuscript O follows an independent course in the exposition of this rule, as of the rest composing the chapter

समं सर्वत्रेति कौहलीपुत्रः ॥ २ ॥

2 Kâuhalîputra says that it is the same everywhere

The comment interprets *samam*, 'same,' as signifying here *tîvrataram*, which it had explained above as an absolute rather than a relative comparative—'very excessive,' rather than 'more excessive' That does not seem likely to be the real meaning As examples, are cited, rather needlessly, *sañraṅ ânâh* (iv 6 1¹ et al), *saṁyattâh* (i 5 1¹ et al), *nyañṅ agniç cetavyah* (v 5 3² only O has *cetavyah*), and *upahûtâṅ3 ho* (ii 6 7³) O gives an entirely different, though equivalent, exposition, and only the last two of these examples, with two others, namely *sarvâṅ agnîṅr apsushadah* (v 6 1²) and *imân lokân* (ii 1 3¹)

The name of the authority quoted is given by G M as Kâuhalîyaputra, and by O as Kohalîputra, in both the text and commentary

अनुस्वारे ऽण्विति भारद्वाजः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Bhâradvâja says it is faint in *anusvâra*

---

2 *sarvatrâ 'nunâsikavarneshu*[1] *tîvrataratvam* [2]*samam iti*[2] *kâuhalîputro*[3] *manyate* *samr-* . . . . *saṁy-* . . . *nyañṅ-* . . . . *upa-* . . . . *ityâdi*

[1] W B *sikyav-*, G M *sikyam v* (2) W *sarvatve 'ti* [3] G M (as also in the rule) *liyap*

O substitutes for the whole *anusvârottamadishu sarveshu samaviçeshena 'nunasikyam syad iti kohaliputr i âcaryo manyate sma tivrataram ity arthah nyann* . . . . *sarvâṅ*. . . *imân* . . . *upa-*. . .

The term *anu*, 'faint,' is explained by *sûkshmatamam* (or, in G M O, *sûkshmataram*), 'exceedingly gentle' In other nasals than *anusvâra*, we are told, Bhâradvâja accepts Çâityâyana's rule, that the nasal quality is extra-strong in the nasal mutes, and simply strong in the *yamas* etc Most of the MSS quote only *tanuvâ jaya tvañ satvâ* (iv 6 6[1] B has dropped out all but the beginning, *nanu*, and O has lost *tanuvâ ja* from the beginning), but O adds counter-examples, *brahmanvanto devâ âsan* (vi 4 10[1]), *rukmam upa dadhâti* (v 2 7[2]), and *tat samyatâñ samyatvam* (v 2 10[6])

नकारस्य रेफोष्मयकारभावाल्लुप्ते च मलोपाच्चोत्तरमुत्तरं तीव्रतरमिति स्थविरः कौण्डिन्यः ॥ ४ ॥

4 Old Kâundinya says that when *n* is converted into *r*, or into a spirant, or into *y* (with loss of the *y*), or when *m* is lost, it is stronger in each case successively

The alterations of an original nasal mute are here rehearsed in the same order, and in the same terms, as in a previous rule (xv 1) The comment gives an example for each case namely *trîñr ekâdaçâñ iha* (iii 2 11[3] G M have lost *iha*, along with all that follows, to the last example, O substitutes *trîñr uta dyûn*, ii 1 11[5]), *çuklâñç ca krshnâñç ca* (ii 3 1[3] O substitutes *rtûñs tanvate*, iv 3 11[3]), *mahâñ indrah* (i 4 20 et al O substitutes *svavâñ indra asme*, i 7 13[5]), and *sañçitam* (iv 1 10[3] et al O substitutes *viharyañ çasyam*, vii 5 5[2]) The first combination is styled *samyo-*

---

3 '*anu sûkshmatamam*[1] *ânunâsikyam anusvâre syâd iti bhâradvâjo manyate yathâ*[2] *tanuvâ* ---- *anusvârâd anyatra çâityâyanavidhih uttameshu tîvrataratvam yamâdishu tîvramatram iti*

[1] G M *anusukshmataram* [2] G M om
O substitutes for the whole *bharadvajasya "caryasya mate 'nusvare 'nu bhavaty ânunasikyam sukshmataram ity arthah ya tvañ* - - *anusvara iti kim ato 'nyatra çâityayanavidhih brahm-* - *ruk* --- *tat* --

4 *nakârasya rephoshmayakârabhâvâc*[1] *cakârâkrshtayakâre*[2] *lupte*[3] *sati malopâc co 'ttaram uttaram*[4] *ânunâsikyam*[5] *ânupûrvyena tîvrataram syâd*[6] *iti sthavirah kâundinyo manyate yathâ*[7] [8]*trîñr* ---- [9]*ity atrâ "nunâsikyam samyogamâtravat çukl-* -- *ity* [10]*atra samçlishtam*[10] *mahâñ* ---- *ity atra tîvrataram* [9] *sañ-* ---- *ity atra tîvrataram ity ânupûrvyam vijñeyam*[8] [11]*ato 'nyatra*[11] *çâityâyanavidhih*

[1] O *rephabhâvâd ûshmabhâvâd yak-* [2] O *shte ya* [3] G M ins *ca* [4] G M om (and read '*ttamam* for '*ttaram uttaram* in rule) [5] O om [6] O *anunâsikyam bhavati* [7] G M om, O *smu* [8] O substitutes *trîñr*--- *rt*--- *sva* --- *â viveça vih*--- *trîñr*- - *ity atra tivrata samyogamatram* *r l*- -- *ity atra samçlishtam sva* --- *ityatra tivrataram vih* --- *itra tivrataram* [9] G M om [10] W *atra tu çl*, B *atranuna samçl*- [11] W B G M *atra*

gamâtravat, 'simple conjunction,' the second, *samçlishta*, 'fused together,' the third and fourth, only *tîvratara*, 'more excessive.' And it is added at the end (only O making the statement intelligibly) that in other cases Çâtyâyana's rule (xvii 1) applies.

व्यञ्जनकालश्च स्वरस्यात्राधिकः ॥ ५ ॥

5. And to the vowel is added, in this case, the time of a consonant.

The "and" (*ca*) in the rule is declared to continue the implication of Old Kâundinya's opinion: according to this authority, here, in the prescription of *anusvâra*, the time of a consonant, half a *mora* (i 37), is to be added to the vowel that is accompanied by *anusvâra*; an example is *yuñjâthâñ râsabham yuvam* (iv 1 2[1] et al.). And "in this case" (*atra*, literally 'here') is added in the rule because the prescription of increased quantity is not of force in the cases detailed in the sixteenth chapter, in nasal mutes, nor where *n* or *m* is converted into *l* (v 25,26,28).

O states the same thing in other language, giving two additional examples, *çatrûñr anapavyayantah* (iv 6 6[3]) and *añhomuce* (i 6 12[3] et al.)—of which the latter, being one of those established in the sixteenth chapter (xvi 29), ought to be a counter-example—and remarking further that in the opinion of other teachers the *anusvâra* merely was added to the vowel. *Anusvâra*, namely, was declared by i 34 to have the quantity of a short vowel, and we should be grateful if the commentator had pointed out in what relation this rule really stands to that, if, indeed, there is any connection between them, and if this does not belong properly to a doctrine that regards the *anusvâra* as an affection of the vowel merely, causing the latter's prolongation, to be sure, but not adding an element with independent quantity to it. O appends the further restriction that the vowel undergoing prolongation is to be a simple one (not a diphthong). And it mentions another interpretation, as put forward by some authorities: that *atra* signifies wherever *anusvâra* is prescribed, and that where there is *anusvâra*, there the quantity of the vowel is to be short in every case.

---

5. *cakâra sthavirakâundinyam*[1] *anvâdiçati atrâ 'nusvâravidhâne sânunâsikasvarasya vyañjanakâlo hrasvârdhakâlo 'dhikah syâd iti sthavirah kâundinyo manyate yuñj---- ityâdi atrâi 'va svarasye 'ti kim sâdishû 'ttameshû 'ttamalabhâve*[2] *câi*[3] *'tad adhikakâlavidhânam*[4] *mâ bhûd iti*

[1] W B *rah kau*, G M *nyamatam*. [2] W B *mabha*. [3] B *nai*, G M *vai*. [4] W *adhikal*, G M *adhitakal*.

O substitutes for the whole *atra 'nusvâre vyañjanakalo hrasvarddhakalamatrah svarasyâ 'dhiko bhavati svarakalat çatr -- añh-.... yuñj .... caçabda sthavirahkaundinyamatanvadiçati itaracaryamate 'nusvâra eva svarasva 'dhika syat atre 'ti kim sradishu 'ttameshu uttamalabhave samanaksharashu cai 'tad adhikalavidhâna ma bhut teshu svarakaladhiko 'nusvara syat apara ahuh atre 'tyanunasikavidhana ity arthah anusvârabhave 'pi vyañjanakalo hrasvakalo bhavati yada 'nusvaras tada sarvatra hrasvakala eva syat*

The Rik (xiii 13) and Vâjasaneyi (iv 147–8) Prâtiçâkhyas also concern themselves with the respective length of a vowel and of *anusvâra* as constituents of a syllable, but their rules stand in no definable relation to the one here given

स्वारविक्रमयोर्दृढप्रयत्नतरः पौष्करसादेः ॥ ६ ॥

6 Pâushkarasâdi says the utterance of *svâra* and *vikrama* is attended with firmer effort

Most of the manuscripts supply in the comment *prayoga*, 'use, application,' as the subject involved in this rule, O supplies simply *varna*, 'alphabetic sound' *Svâra*, we are told, means *svarita*, 'circumflex,' O signifying the same thing by pointing out that the *svâras* are enumerated in the twentieth chapter (xx 1–8) *Vikrama* is a particular kind of *anudâtta*, 'grave,' or, O says, is explained in the nineteenth chapter (xix 1,2) As examples are given *yò 'syá svò 'gnís tám ápi* (v 7 9[1] G M O omit the last two words) and *ásyè havíh priyám* (iii 3 11[1]), for the latter of which O substitutes *çikyàm abhy úpa dadhâti* (v 2 4[3]) we have here two kinds of *svâra* or *svarita*, namely *abhinihata* (xx 4) and *nitya* (xx 2), and one or more cases of *vikrama* (the grave syllable standing directly between two that are either acute or circumflex) in each example A counter-example is *gâ'm vâ'vá tâ'u tát páry avadatâm* (i 7 2[2] only O has the last two words), which contains (except in O 's addition) neither *svâra* nor *vikrama*

प्रयत्नविशेषात्सर्ववर्णानामिति शैत्यायनः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Çâityâyana says, of all the letters, according to their difference of effort

The comment (except in O) supplies the same subject as in the preceding rule, namely *prayoga*, and also continues the predicate of that rule, *drdhaprayatnatarah* The latter we can hardly approve, since to assert a specially firm effort of all alphabetic sounds without exception is little better than nonsense Çâityâyana may rather be credited with meaning that each constituent of the alphabet has its own proper (*svocita*) degree of articulative effort—which is more true than edifying

---

6 *svâre vikrame ca prayogah pâushkarasâder mate*[1] *drdhaprayatnataro bhavati svârah svarita ity arthah. vikramo nâmâ 'nudâttaviçeshah yathâ*[2] *yo.... âsye.... svâravikramayor iti kim gâm.... drdhah*[3] *prayatno* [4]*yasyâ 'sâu*[4] *drdhaprayatnah atiçayena drdhaprayatno drdhaprayatnatarah*

[1] B *tam* [2] G M om [3] W B *dha*, G M *dha eva* [(4)] G M om

O substitutes for the whole *svârâ vinçadanuvâke gâmyante ekâttavinçadanuvâke vikramah svareshu vikrameshu ca drdhaprayatnataro varno bhavati pâuskarasâdar mate çikyam . yo... . svaravikramayor iti kim gâm .*

As example, is cited the first phrase of the Sanhitâ, *ishe tvo "rje tvâ* (i 1 1 only O has the last two words)

The manuscripts of the commentary leave us quite in a quandary as to the value of these seven rules, W B calling them approved, but G M O unapproved

नातिव्यक्तं न चाव्यक्तमेवं वर्णानुदिङ्गयेत् ।
पयःपूर्णमिवामत्रं हरन्धीरो यथामति ॥
इत्यात्रेय आत्रेयः ॥ ८ ॥

8 Âtreya says, one must utter the sounds not over distinctly and not indistinctly, taking, as it were, a vessel filled with drink, steady, according to the sense

The commentator gives only a simple paraphrase of this verse, and casts no real light upon its meaning, even as regards the naive and not very instructive comparison in the second line

---

CHAPTER XVIII

CONTENTS 1–7, opinions of various authorities as to the mode of utterance of the auspicious syllable *om*

---

7 *sarvavarnânâm prayogah*[1] *svocitaprayatnaviçeshâd*[2] *drdhaprayatnataro*[3] *bhavatî 'ti çâityâyano manyate yathâ*[4] *ishe....ityâdi*

[5]*nâi 'tâni*[5] *supta sûtrânî 'shtâni*

[1] B *-ga* [2] B *syoc*, W B *sha*, G M *shat* [3] W *-tnah prayatnatamo*, B *tnah prayatnataro* [4] G M om [5] W B *etani*
O substitutes for the whole *çai'yayanasya "caryasya mate svaprayatnaviçeshatth sarvavarnanam vaiçeshyad drdhaprayatnatarah evam varneshu bhavati na svasvâravikramayor eve 'ti yatha ishe.... nai 'tani* etc

8 *ativyaktam*[1] *atispashtam avyaktam aspashtam ca*[2] *yathâ na bhavaty evam varnân udinguyed uccârayed* [3]*ity arthah*[3] *payahpûrnam ivâ*[4] *'matram kshîrapûritam*[5] *bhâjanam*[6] [7]*harann iva*[7] *yathâmati matim*[8] *anatikramya* [9]*dhîro 'dhyetâ*[9] *bhaved*[10] *ity âtreyo manyate*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane saptadaço[11] *'dhyâyah*

[1] W *nâ 'tiv* [2] O om [3] G M om [4] O om *iva* [5] W *kshiram apu-*, B *-iraparipu-*, O *-iram pu* [6] G M *amatram* [7] O *paratniva* [8] W O *m* [9] W O om *dhiro*, G M *adhyata yathâ dhiro* [10] G M *vet tathe* [11] G M O *dvitiyapraçne pañcamo*

ओकारं तु प्रणव एके ऽर्धतृतीयमात्रं ब्रुवते ॥ १ ॥

1. As *pranava*, some utter *o* with two and a half *moras*.

In the text of this rule, T. reads *oṅkâram*, and B. *omkâram*; in the comment, at the beginning, W. B. have *omkâram*. Doubtless the unnasalized form is the true reading; that *oṅ* or *om* should be uttered with more than the quantity of a long syllable would not be worth the trouble of specifying, in view of rules i. 34 and xvii. 5, which would require either three or two and a half *moras* for the combination. Whether we are to infer that this holy exclamation was not yet uttered with a nasal ending at the time when the Prâtiçâkhya was made, is a more doubtful question; the whole matter lies, at any rate, outside the proper province of a Prâtiçâkhya. By way of examples, the comment appears to intend to quote the first and last words of the Sanhitâ and of the Brahmana: namely *om ishe tvâ* (i. 1. 1), *samudro bandhuh om* (vii. 5. 25²? see below: B. omits the *om*), *om brahma samdhattam* (Tâitt. Brâh. i. 1. 1), and *yebhyaç câi 'nat prâhuh om* (B. omits the *om*: the Calcutta edition of the Tâittirîya-Brâhmana being incomplete, I can only presume that these are the concluding words of that treatise). The manuscripts G. M. O. put these extracts in a different order, giving the two conclusions first, and then the two beginnings; G. M. add *om* at the end of each, while O. gives no *om* at all. G. M. further append two more citations, *bhadram karnebhih* • *om*, and *âi 'va tapati om*, of which the former is the beginning, and the latter, I presume, the end, of the Tâittirîya-Âranyaka. With regard to the phrase *samudro bandhuh*, it is to be observed that the Sanhitâ as found in my manuscript (or rather, manuscripts, for mine contains the last leaf of another and entirely independent one, which has the same reading), and in those to which Prof. Weber has access, ends with *samudrah* simply; but another word like this is evidently wanting to complete the sense (the concluding sentence is *samudro vâ açvasya yonih samudrah*), and is not less needed to make up the tale of words as enumerated in the ending, which counts "twelve" after *avahat*, while without *bandhuh* there are

---

1. *pranava*[1] *okâram*[2] [3]*ardhatrtîyamâtram eke bruvate*[3] [4]*eka âcâryâ ardhatrtîyamâtram* [5] *âhur ity arthah*[4] [6]*ardham*[7] *trtîyam yayos te ardhatrtîye ardhatrtîyamâtre*[8] *yasyâ 'sâv*[6] *ardhatrtîyamâtrah*[9] *yathâ*[10] [11]*om ishe tvâ samudro bandhuh om om brahma samdhattam yebhyaç câi 'nat prâhuh om*[11] *kâlanirnaye 'py evam* [12] *varnitam*

svâdhyâyârambhaçeshasya [13]*pranavasya svarasya ca*[13]
adhyâyasyâ[14] [15]*'nuvâkasyâ 'nte syâd ardhatrtîyatâ*[15]

tuçabdasya[16] *prayojanam ucyate samdhyaksharânâm vedapranavam*[17] *câ 'ntarâ tathe 'ti kâlanirnaye samdhyaksharânâm* [18]*hrasvâ na santî*[18] *'ti*[19] *pâninîye 'py okâramâtrasya*[20] *dîrghakâlo*[21]

only eleven This is a very strange fact, and calls for a wider examination of Taittirîya manuscripts, to see if any of them have saved the lost final word

Then is quoted a verse "from the Kalanirnaya," to the effect that "the quantity of two and a half *moras* belongs to the *pranava* and to a vowel forming the beginning or end (?) of a passage that one reads in the Veda, also at the end of a chapter or section" The Kalanirnaya quoted here and below must, of course, be a very different work from that of Mâdhava bearing the same title (Weber's Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS, No 1166)

In explanation of the word *tu* in the rule, another half verse, from which I extract no suitable meaning, is quoted from the Kalanirnaya, and the authority of Panini is further appealed to to prove that among the diphthongs there is no short quantity hence for simple *o* long quantity is determined here, "however" (*tu*), when the diphthong stands in *pranava*, that quantity is negatived, and (quoting, apparently, another half-verse) for the *pranava*, as occurring in the Veda, is prescribed long quantity along with [the quantity of ?] *a m* That is to say, the *tu* intimates a denial of the ordinary quantity of the diphthong *o* And the remark is finally added that a difference of quantity is to be recognized in the different *pranavas*

उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितानां कस्मिंश्चिदिति शैत्यायनः ॥२॥

2 Çâityâyana says it is to be uttered with either one of acute, grave, or circumflex

The comment simply paraphrases the rule, adding nothing in its explanation—not even telling us in what relation it stands to rule 7, and whether Çâityâyana would let us give the word, in any given case of its use, whatever accent we chose, or would have us governed by reasons in our choice between the three accents

---

nirûpitah[22] *iha tu*[23] *pranavasthatvariçeshenâ*[24] *'sâu kâlo nishidhyate vedasthapranave*[25] *tu syât* [26]*samakaradvimâtrate*[26] *'ti* [27]*pranavaviçeshe kalaviçeshah*[27] *pratyetavyah*

[1] W B *ve*, G M *venu* [2] W B *omka-* [(3)] O *-triyamanate* [(4)] G M O om B ins *iti* [(6)] W *ardhatritiyamatram bruvate pranave okaram* [7] B O *ardha* [8] G M O *matre* [9] G M *triyas tam*, O *triyamas tam sardhadvimatra ity arthah* [10] W B O om [(11)] G M *sam ---* om *ye - --* om *ish-* om *brah -* om *bhad -- -* om *ar -* om O *sam --* *ye ----* *ish - -* *brah ----* [13] B ins *ca* [(1)] B *pranavasvaratasya* [14] B *adhyayat ca* [(15)] G M *kasya tv ante to 'rdhatr*, O *triye tu* [16] B *nu*, G M *antar* [17] G M *dañ ca pr*, O *dam ca pranavam* [(18)] O *svo nu 'sti* [19] W om *iti* [20] O *okarasya* [21] W G M *-le* [22] G M *te* [23] B om [24] O *shad*, G M *shanad* [25] W B O *sya pr* [(26)] B *kalo dv*, G M *-kale dv*, O *kare dvimatrete* [(27)] G M *pranavasya viçeshah*

2 *udâttânudâttasvaritânâm madhye kasmiñç cit svare pranavah prayoktavya iti çâityâyano brûte yathâ om*

O substitutes *utte anudatte svarite vâ esha madhyatamena svarena prayoktavya syad iti çâityâyanamah âcaryo manyate* o3 o3

धृतप्रचयः कौण्डिन्यस्य ॥ ३ ॥

3 According to Kâundinya, it is a sustained *pracaya*

I have ventured to translate the word *dhrta* in *dhrtapracaya* by 'sustained,' but without feeling sure that it might not have been better to follow the lead of the commentator, who treats *dhrtapracaya* as equivalent to simple *pracaya* He brings up, it is true, the objection that in xix 2 the use of the term *pracaya* itself is attributed to this same Kâundinya, and that hence it should have been used here, but replies "not so, by this pair of words, even, an appellation is given thus, namely on the principle that even where there is no difference of meaning there may be a difference of application, the teacher exhibits a nicety of application other examples of the principle are the names [of the second Pândava] Bhîmasena and Bhîma, [of one of Çiva's wives] Bhâmâ [G M say Satya] and Satyabhamâ, *pidhâna* and *apidhâna*, *dîpa* and *pradîpa*" The *pracaya* is defined as the fourth accent, and O adds that it is to be explained in the twenty first chapter (namely, at xxi 10,11) it is there said to be of the same tone as *udâtta*, 'acute,' so that, unless *dhrta* is to be regarded as signifying a modification, one does not see in what respect Kâundinya's opinion differs from that of Valmîki, given in rule 6 of this chapter

मध्यमेन स वाक्प्रयोगः ॥ ४ ॥

4 That application of the voice is with middle tone

The meaning of this precept is very obscure, and the commentator's exposition does not give the impression that he comprehended it According to him, the *sa*, 'that,' points us back to the utterance as prescribed by Kaundinya in the preceding rule in whatever pitch of voice the application is made, the *pranava* is to be used with medial effort, or with one that takes into account the

---

3 *kâundinyasya*[1] *mate pranavo dhrtapracayo bhavati caturthah*[2] *svaro dhrtapracaya iti kathyate nanu pracayapûrvaç ca kâundinyasya* (xix 2) *itivat pracaya ity etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam* [3]*kim dhrtaçabdena nâi 'vam* [3] *padadvayenâ 'py anena nâmadheyam abhidhîyate*[4] *tathâ hi arthabhedâbhâve*[5] *'pi prayogabhedo*[6] *'stî 'ti prayogacâturyam*[7] *âcâryah prakatayati yathâ bhîmaseno*[8] *bhîmah bhâmâ*[9] *satyabhâmâ* [10] *pidhânam apidhânam dîpah pradîpa ityâdi*

[1] W *-nya* [2] B G M *tha* (3) G M *dhrtaçabdo nama evam* [4] G M *evâ 'bh* [5] B *ardhabh-*, G M *itthani bhe-* [6] B *-gaprabh-* [7] W *gântaracâ-* [8] W *ne*, B *-na* [9] G M om [10] G M ins *satyâ*

O substitutes *dhrtahpracayo nama turiyasvarah sa evâi 'kavinçe 'nuvâke vakshyate dhrtapracaya iti nâmadheyam prayânam api vyapadiçyata iti kaundinya âcâryo manyate dhrtapracayah pranavo bhavati yatha om iti udâttapracayo çrutyabhedam tat svaravyñanukrtam phalam anutiyate*

combination of high and low tone The relation of *vâk* in the compound is described as that of a locative case, and the word is paraphrased by *vâcah sthâne*, 'in position (i e, I presume, 'quality' or 'temperament,' compare xxii 11, xxiii 4,5) of voice'

स्वरितः प्लाक्षिप्लाक्षायणयोः ॥५॥

5 According to Plâkshi and Plâkshâyana, it is circumflexed

This rule is, along with its three predecessors, pronounced by the commentator unapproved

उदात्तो वाल्मीकेः ॥६॥

6 According to Vâlmîki, it is acute

This is the only rule in the chapter, except the first, which the commentator allows to stand as approved In his school, then, the vowel part of the sacred exclamation is to be two and a half *moras* long, and of acute tone This agrees with the teaching of the Vaj (ii 51) and Rik (xv 3) Prâtiçâkhyas, save that these give (what is really equivalent to the same thing) three *moras* to the whole word *om*, and the Rik Pr mentions other opinions both as to its quantity and its accent

यथाप्रयोगं वा सर्वेषां यथाप्रयोगं वा सर्वेषाम् ॥७॥

7 All allow that it may also be according to the application

The commentator first quotes an absurd opinion of Mâhisheya's, to the effect that *yathâprayogam*, 'according to the application,' here means *udâtta*, 'acute,' but then goes on to set forth, as given by Vararuci, what appears to be the real meaning of the rule namely, that with whatever tone the passage to be read [i e its beginning] is used, that tone is to be given also to the introductory exclamation Thus, before *ishê tvâ* (i 1 1 et al), which begins with

---

4 *prayujyata iti prayogah madhyameno 'ccanîcasamâhâravicakshanena prayatnena pranavah*[1] *yatra*[2] *kvacana vâca sthâne*[3] *prayogo bhavati sa*[4] *iti kâundinyâbhimatah pûrvokto grhyate vâci prayogo vâkprayogah*

[1] W *-va*, G M *-vah prayoktavyah* [2] W *anya-* [3] W B *na* [4] B om O substitutes *ko 'yam pranavo nama vavaprayogah* [i e *vakpr*] *kaudinyamatam âdiçya yatra kvacana sthane drçyate tena madhyamena svarena prayoktavyah*

5 *plâkshiplâkshâyanayoh*[1] *pakshe*[2] *svarito bhavati nâi 'tat sûtracatushtayam ishtam*

[1] O ins *âcâryayor* [2] O *mate* G M O add *pranava*

6 *vâlmîker mate pranava udâtto bhavati*[1]

[1] O adds *yathâ*

grave, the *om* is to be grave, before *â'pa undantu* (i 2 1[1] wanting in W B), acute, before *vy'rddham* (v 1 2[1] W B have instead, evidently as a corrupt reading only, *vyûdhah*, with which word no *anuvâka* in the Sanhitâ begins), circumflex

The rule is declared unapproved—rather hard treatment for one which professes to lay down a principle accepted by all authorities

---

CHAPTER XIX

CONTENTS 1–2, occurrence of *vikrama*, between syllables of high tone, 3–5, of *kampa*, in a circumflex followed by a circumflex

स्वरितयोर्मध्ये यत्र नीचः स्यादुदात्तयोर्वान्यतरतो वोदात्तस्वरितयोः स विक्रमः ॥ १ ॥

1 Where a syllable of low tone occurs between two circumflex syllables, or two acute, or two of which either one is acute and the other circumflex, that is *vikrama*

The commentator paraphrases the rule as if *anyataratah* meant 'between a preceding circumflex and a following acute,' and the following *udâttasvaritayoh* 'between a preceding acute and a fol-

---

7 *yathâprayogaçabdeno*[1] *'dâtto 'bhidhîyata iti mâhisheyapakshah pranave*[2] *yathâprayogam vâ kuryâd iti sarveshâm rshînâm matam vararucipakshas tu vakshyate adhyeshyamânam*[3] *yathâprayogam yathâvidhasvaram* [4]*tathâvidhena vâ*[4] *svarena pranavah prayoktavya iti sarveshâm matam iti yathâ*[5] *ishe tve 'ty anenâ 'dhyeshyamanenâ*[6] *'nudattena pranavo 'py anudâttah* [7]*âpa undantv ity udatteno 'dâttah*[7] *vyrddham iti*[8] *svaritena svaritah*

ne 'dam sûtram ishtam

O (corrected a little) substitutes *yathavidhena svarena 'dhyeshyamano bhavati tathâvidhena svarenai 'va pranavah prayoktavyah esha va sarvesham acaryânam sâdharanapranavavidhir bhavati ishe tve 'ty etad adhyeshyamanena udâttah pranavo vaktavyah apa - ity udattah vyrddham iti svaritah acaryagrahanam tesham kirtyartham pakshaparigrahavyñanasadrshtah parikalpana ne 'dam sutram ishtam*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane ashtadaço[9] *'dhyâyah*

[1] W *-yasaç* [2] G M *-vam* [3] W *adhyeprathamanam* [(4)] G M *-vidha* [5] W B om [6] W. *'dhyayamânâ*, B *-mânâ* [(7)] W B om [8] W B om [9] G M O *dvitiyapraçne shashtho*

lowing circumflex' He adds examples of a *vikrama* syllable in each of the four defined positions namely *yò 'sya svo 'gnís tám ápi* (v 7 9[1] G M O omit the last two words), *vódhavê* (i 6 2[1] et al), *dhánvanâ gâ'h* (iv 6 6[1]), and *tásya kvà suvargó lokáh* (ii 6 5[5] O omits the last word, G M the last two) In the third example, the circumflex by which the *vikrama* syllable is preceded is the enclitic, this shows us (what we should have inferred without it) that, as regards the application of the present precept, no distinction is made between the independent and the enclitic circumflex As an example of the use of the term, and showing the necessity of its definition here, is quoted rule xvii 6, where we are told that Paushkarasâdi asserts the utterance of *svâra* ('circumflex') and *vikrama* with a firmer effort The word occurs elsewhere only at xxiii 20 and xxiv 5, where we have no assurance that it signifies the same thing as here It is found, among the other Prâtiçâkhyas, in that to the Rig Veda only, and has there no such meaning

The *vikrama* is marked by the usual sign of low tone, the horizontal stroke beneath The following rule, as we shall see, extends its definition so as to include nearly all the syllables so marked

• The construction of *sa* in the rule, as agreeing in gender with *vikramah*, though referring to *nîcam* (*aksharam*), was alluded to above, under v 2

प्रचयपूर्वश्च कौण्डिन्यस्य ॥ २ ॥

2 As also, according to Kâundinya, when a *pracaya* precedes

The *pracaya* (see xxi 10 11) is the series of unaccented syllables following a circumflex (enclitic or independent) in connected discourse, and uttered, save the one next preceding another following circumflex or an acute, in the tone of acute This last one of the

1 [1]*yatra svaritayor*[1] *madhya* [3] *udâttayor vâ*[4] *'nyatarato ve 'ti svaritodâttayor ve*[5] *'ty arthah* [6] *udâttasvaritayor vâ*[7] *madhye nîcam yad aksharam sa vikramo*[8] *bhavati svaritayor*[9] *madhye yathâ yo* - [10]*udâttayor yathâ*[10] *vodhave svaritodâttayor yathâ dhanv-* - - *udâttasvaritayor yathâ tasya*- - - *vikramasamjñâyâh prayojanam svâravikramayor drdhaprayatnatara* (xvii 6) *iti*

(1) O *yad dvayor* [2] B G M ins *sthale* [3] G M ins *va* [4] G M om [5] G M om *va* [6] G M ins *iti va* [7] O om , G M put after *madhye* [8] G M *masam jño* [9] O *tayor* (10) O om

2 *cakâro*[1] *vikrama iti jñâpayati* [2]*kâundinyasya mata udâttaparah svaritaparo vâ pracayapûrvaç ca vikramo vijñeyah udâttaparo yathâ pary*- - - [2] *svaritaparo yathâ upar*- - - - *pracayah pûrvo yasmâd* [3]*asâu pracayapûrvah* [3]

[1] G M O *caçabdo* (2) W om (3) G M *sa tathoktah*

series, which retains its grave tone, is here declared to be, on Kaundinya's authority, likewise entitled to the appellation *vikrama* This makes the term apply to all syllables in the *samhitâ* that are marked by the horizontal stroke below, excepting those which, after a pause, precede the first accented syllable The commentator cites two examples, *pâry avadatâm yâ' yajñê dîyáte* (i 7 2^{2} lost in W , only O has the last two words) and *upârishtâllakshmâ yâjyâ'* (ii 6 2$^{3\ 4}$ et al), in the first of which the *pracaya* is followed by an acute, in the second by a circumflex

It is to be observed that the *vikrama* appears, so far as this treatise is concerned, to be a mere name, no peculiarity of tone is claimed to belong to it the other treatises offer nothing analogous

As nothing is said of the non-approval of the rule, we may regard it as accepted in the school represented by the commentator

द्वियम एके द्वियमपरे ता अणुमात्राः ॥ ३ ॥

3 According to some, in a circumflex syllable that is followed by a circumflex, quarter *moras* are so

I have rendered this rule according to my own persuasion of its true meaning, and not at all in conformity with the interpretation of the commentator, who says "*yama* [W alone says *dviyama*] is a synonym of *svarita*, where there are two such *yamas*, without intervention of anything, that is a *dviyama*, what is followed by such a *dviyama*, that is *dviyamapara* in the former, and also in the latter, where there is a third *yama* [so in G M , which is the best reading the others perhaps mean *triyame*], whatever circumflexed materials there are, all those are depressed at the end to the extent of a quarter-*mora* so some think An example of a *dviyama* is *tè 'nyò 'nyásmâi* (ii 2 11^{5} but B G M have instead *tè 'nyò 'nyám*, vi 1 5^{1}), of a *dviyamapara*, *sò 'pò 'bhy àmriyata* (vi 1 1^{7}, 4 2^{3}) Whence do we derive the implication 'at the end?' from the precept 'and likewise, at the end of a word are *kampas*, quarter-*moras* depressed at the end' And the implication of

---

3 *yamaçabdah*[1] *svaritaparyâyah dvâu yamâu yatra deçe nâirantaryena*[2] *vartete sa dviyamah tasmin dviyamah paro yasmâd asâu dviyamaparah tasminç ca dviyame*[3] *sati yâh*[4] *svaritaprakrtayas tâh sarvâ antato 'numâtrâ*[5] *nihatâ*[6] *bhavantî 'ty eke manyante dviyamo yathâ te- - - -* [7]*dviyamaparo yathâ*[7]*· so- - - - antata*[8] *iti katham pratîyate padânte ca*[9] *tathâ*[10] *kampâ antata nihatânukâ*[11] *iti vacanâd iti brûmah nihatam*[12] *tu svaritayor madhye yatra nîcam* (xix 1) *ity*[13] *etatsâmnidhyâl labhyate çikshâ câi 'vam vakshyati*[14]

> *nityo 'bhinihataç*[15] *câi 'va kshâiprah praçlishta eva ca*
> *ete svârâh*[16] *prakampante yatro 'ccasvaritodayâ*[17]
> *çeshasyo 'dâttatâ vâ syât svâratâ*[19] *vâ vyavasthaye*

depression comes by vicinage from rule 1, above, where a syllable of low tone between two that are circumflexed is spoken of. This seems to me entirely inadmissible. In *yama* as a synonym of *svarita*, and meaning 'circumflex,' I cannot in the least believe; and the designation of a case of three successive circumflexes as *dviyamapara* would be excessively awkward, even without the omission of the *ca*, 'and,' which would be needed to connect it, in that signification, with *dviyama*. On the other hand, *dviyama*, 'of double pitch,' is an entirely natural and acceptable synonym for *svarita*, 'circumflex,' the essential characteristic of which is that it combines the high and the low tone within the limits of the same syllable; and "a circumflex followed by a circumflex" includes every possible case. The limitation "at the end" is properly enough left to be understood from the nature of the case; but that the predicate "depressed," the most important part of the precept, should remain to be inferred by vicinage only, and from the subject, not the predicate, of the two preceding rules, is not to be tolerated. And I have no doubt that the *tâh* in the rule is the predicate, and represents *vikrama*, its gender and number being adapted to those of *anumâtrâh* by the grammatical figure *anyonyânvaya*, to which the commentator (see under ii 7, v 2) has several times appealed in other like cases. There remains, as the only difficulty, the plural number of both words: we should certainly expect rather *sâ 'numâtrâ*; but even if we have to let this pass unexplained, it is vastly more easy to get along with than the difficulties which beset the other interpretation. One hardly dares presume to suggest that the present reading is the result of an alteration, made after the meaning given in the comment was ascribed to the rule.

The commentator goes on to quote a verse from the Çikshâ, to the effect that the four kinds of independent circumflex (see xx 1, 2,4,5) suffer *kampa* when they precede either an acute or a circumflex. This verse is (save that it gives the Taittirîya instead of the Rik names to the accents) the same with that which is interpolated in the Rik Pr., at the end of the third chapter (iii 19). He adds further, in another half verse, doubtless from the same authority, that "of the remainder, there may either be the quality of acute or of circumflex, respectively;" and explains this "respectively" as

---

vyavasthâçabdenâ 'nena[20] *dvividhah kampa uktah samhitâyâm svaritakampa*[21] *itaravedabhaga*[22] *udâttakampa*[23] *iti ye*[24] *kampâh prasiddhâs*[25] *teshv* [26] *etal lakshanam na tu kampavidhâyakam anyathâ yo.... ityâdâu kampah prasajyeta*

ne 'dam sûtram ishtum

[1] W *dviy*. [2] W *noran-*, O *norantatary-*. [3] G M *triyayame*. [4] W *yam*, M *vâ*. [5] O *tra*. [6] W *niyata*, B *abhihata*, G M *'bhihita*. [(7)] O om. [8] O *anta*. [9] O *ka*. [10] W B *yatha*. [11] O *hi hat*. [12] G *nihit*, O *tatvam*. [13] B om. [14] O *-te*. [15] B *hitaç*. [16] G M *svar*. [17] W *trasv-*, M *ccâccasv-*, O *ccasyasv-*, G M *-yâd*, O *ye*. [18] O om. [19] B *-tor*, G M *svarito*. [20] W *nte*, O om *anena*. [21] W *tah k*, B *-ta uktah k*. [22] G M *re ve*. [23] W *ttah k*. [24] W B O om. [25] G M om. [26] B O ins *eva*.

implying that there are two kinds of *kampa* in the Sanhitâ, that before a circumflex, in other parts of the Veda, that before an acute, and concludes the exposition with pointing out (if I understand him) that this is a definition applying to those cases of *kampa* which are otherwise established, but that it is not a precept requiring *kampa*, since this would otherwise have to appear in such passages as *yò 'pâ'm pûshpam vêda* (only G M have *veda* the passage is not to be found in the Sanhitâ, and possibly is intended to be quoted from one of those "other parts of the Veda," referred to above) Finally, he remarks that the rule is unapproved

The term *kampa* is not found anywhere in the text of our Prâtiçakhya, or of that of the Rig-Veda, although the commentary to the latter (under iii 3,4), like our own, employs it to signify the peculiar modification undergone by the circumflex, when immediately followed by a high tone The Atharva Prâtiçakhya (iii 65) gives to the same modification the kindred name of *vikampita* It is signified, in the Rik and Atharvan texts (as is fully explained and illustrated in the note to Ath Pr iii 65), by appending to the vowel of the circumflex syllable a figure, either 1 or 3, and applying to the figure the signs of both circumflex and grave accentuation The theory of this mode of designation is obscure, and no account of it is given in any Prâtiçakhya, nor, so far as I am aware, in any other Hindu authority that has yet come to light We should imagine the figure to be a mere *point d'appui* for an added sign of grave tone, but that there appears in a part of the Vedic texts an accompanying prolongation of the *vikampita* vowel (if the vowel be short), of which the figure, therefore, appears to be the sign of this prolongation the Prâtiçakhyas give no hint

This accent wears a quite peculiar aspect in the Tâittirîya text, as compared with those to which reference has been made In the first place, being limited to the case of a circumflex before a circumflex, it is relatively of rare occurrence, there being fewer examples of it in the whole Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ than in the first book alone of the Atharvan (it occurs in the former, if I have overlooked nothing, only at ii 1 6^5, 2 11^5 v 4 3^3 vi 1 1^7,5^1,$11^{2,5}$, 2 $2^{1,2}$, 3 2^5, 4^2, 4 2^3,9^2,10^1, 6 8^1 and in the ending to v 2 1) Secondly, it is always intimated by an appended figure 1, with simply the mark of *anudâtta* tone, or of *vikrama*, written beneath, while the circumflex vowel retains the mark of circumflex accent*—and this is clearly the method most easily defensible on theoretic grounds

---

* That is to say, this is uniformly the case in my manuscript, which, for example, writes the commentator's quoted instances as follows

तें१ न्योन्यस्मै सां१ पां१ भ्यंम्रियत

and the MSS of the comment all add the figure 1, although, as everywhere else, they omit the accent signs In the two cases that occur in the part of the Calcutta edition thus far printed, it seems to be by mere unintelligent blundering that the above method is departed from, a 3 being added in the one (ii 1 6^5), without any sign of *vikrama* beneath it, and no designation being attempted in the other (ii 2 11^5)

the figure represents the quantity that is added to the syllable to make room for the *vikrama* tone at the end, and it gets, therefore, the *vikrama* sign Thirdly, in the only two passages (vi 3 4[2], 6 8[1]) in which the vowel of the circumflexed syllable is short, it is made long

What the commentator means by declaring the rule of no force, it is not easy to say It can hardly be that his school acknowledged no *kampa* at all, and we should have expected him rather to interpret into his text the usage which he and his fellow-*çâkhinah* accepted as proper—as he has done in so many other cases There appears to be no discordance between the teachings of the Prâtiçâkhya in this chapter and the practice in the known Tâittirîya text (but see the note on the next rule), the former, to be sure, do not fully explain the latter, but this is the case also with the other Vedas

The denial of *kampa* in a circumflex syllable before an acute constitutes the most important and conspicuous peculiarity in the Taittirîya system of accentuation as compared with that of the Rik and Atharvan, and also puts the former at a disadvantage in respect to clearness Its effect is to deprive us of any constant means of distinguishing whether the syllable following a circumflex is an acute, or a grave with *pracaya* tone (xxi 10), and whether that distinction shall be shown at all depends upon mere accident For example, *so 'smâ't* and *sò 'smât* would be accented before a pause precisely alike, and so with any number of acutes or graves following a circumflex before a pause e g *sò 'smâd abhavat* and *sò 'smâ'd yó vâ'i tát** And even if, instead of a pause, other syllables follow, there must be at least two grave syllables in succession to bring out the true condition of things we see that the syllable after the circumflex is acute in *hy èshá pṛthivyâ'h*, but not in *hy ètád devâ'h*, and the *samhitâ* does not tell us whether in *so 'smâd etarhi* the *asmât* is accented or toneless † And so often does this ambiguity arise, that in the first chapter of the third book there are not less than twenty cases of *pracayas*, all whose syllables except the last admit of being understood as true acutes ‡ Other possible cases of ambiguity, of less frequency and importance, I pass without notice

This same peculiarity belongs also to the existing Tâittirîya-Brâhmana and Âranyaka, so that the commentator's allusion to "other parts of the Veda" as differing from the Sanhitâ in respect to *kampa* is of doubtful meaning

---

* Thus, सो ऽस्मादभवत्। and सो ऽस्माद्यो वै तत्।

† Thus ह्येष पृथिव्याः and ह्येतद्देवाः and सो ऽस्मादेतर्हि

‡ Thus, सो ऽकामयत प्रजाः may be either *so 'kamayata praja'h* or *sò 'kâ'máyátá prajâ'h*

तस्यामेव प्रकृतौ ॥ ४ ॥

4 In that very material

The commentator's interpretation of this rule is just as violent and unsatisfactory as is that which he gave of its predecessor, and with which he forces it into strange connection He says, "in a *dviyama* passage there is depression to the extent of a quarter-*mora* only in that—namely, the former—circumflex material, but, in a passage where a *dviyama* follows, there is depression to the extent of a quarter-*mora* of the two former materials, but they do not all share in the quarter-*mora* effect that is what the *eva* means And Kâuhaleya says thus 'of two, the former is *anumâtrika*, of three, the two former are *anumâtrika*, beyond that, the natural condition holds'"

I think we can have no hesitation whatever as to rejecting this if the treatise had been intending to say what is here claimed, it would have said it in a very different manner What is really meant, may be much more doubtful, but I imagine that we are directed to find our quarter-*mora* of *vikrama* in the very substance of the circumflex syllable itself, that is to say, not in any protraction of it, and so, that that treatment of the case which is signified by the insertion of a figure after the circumflex vowel is rejected This, if established, would make the doctrine of the authorities (*eke*, rule 3) here reported in fact discordant with the practice followed in the recorded text

न पूर्वशास्त्रे न पूर्वशास्त्रे ॥ ५ ॥

5 Not in the former teaching

A rule of very obscure import, and respecting which the commentator has only his guesses to give us He ventures two first, that *pûrvaçâstra* signifies the rule respecting *vikrama*, and that in it this affection of the quarter-*mora* finds no place, second, that *pûrvaçâstra* means the first rule of the chapter (which amounts, so far, to the same thing with the other), and that the name of

---

4 *dviyamasthale pûrvasyâm* [1]*eva tasyâm*[1] *svaritaprakrtâv anumâtrayâ*[2] *'pi*[3] *nihatatvam*[4] *bhavati dviyamapare tu*[5] *sthale pûrvayor eva prakrtyor*[6] *anumâtrayâ*[7] *nihatatvam*[8] *bhavati na tu*[9] *tâh sarvâ anukâryabhâja*[10] *ity evakâro bodhayati evam eva kâuhaleya*[11] *âha dvayoh pûrvo*[12] *'numâtrikas*[13] *trishu* [14] *pûrvâv*[15] *anumâtrikâv*[16] *uttarah*[17] *prakrtye 'ti*

(1) W *aparasyâm* [2] B *trayo*, G M *anumatram a* [3] O om [4] B *-hit-* [5] G M *tat* [6] B *tyâyo* [7] B *numâtrayor*, G M *anumâtrâyâ* [8] B *-hit-* [9] W O *nu* [10] G M *anuk-*, O *anumâtram bhajate* [11] W *-liya* [12] W *-rva*, B O *rvah* [13] W B O *anu*, M O *trakas* [14] W ins *ca* [15] O *purvo vâ*, G M *pûrvo yathâ uparisht* etc (end of comment to rule 2, above). [16] W *kâ*, M *trakav*, O *trako 'py* [17] W *ratah*

vikrama, there given, does not apply here in the rule for *kampa*, since, by xvii 6, *vikrama* is uttered with a firmer effort of the organs, while that is not the case with *kampa* There is nothing in either of these proposals to commend it to our acceptance If we were ourselves to guess, we should perhaps say that the reference was to rule 4 only, which teaches *kampa* without any protraction, and that this was confessed to be a doctrine not before authoritatively taught But we should not presume to put the conjecture forward with any confidence

---

CHAPTER XX

CONTENTS 1–8, names of the different kinds of circumflex independent and enclitic, 9–12, different degrees of force of their utterance

इवर्णोकारयोर्यवकारभावे क्षैप्र उदात्तयोः ॥ १ ॥

1 When *i*, *î*, and *u* are converted into *y* or *v*, the accent is *kshâipra*, if they were acute

The conversion of *i*, *î*, and *u* into *y* or *v* is by rule x 15, *û* does not fall under such a rule on account of its being always *pragraha* (iv 5) Rule x 16 prescribes the conditions under which a circumflex accent is the result of such a conversion, and the addition of *udâttayoh* to the present rule is wholly unnecessary—a case to exercise the ingenuity of the commentator in defending the treatise from the charge of *pâunaruktya* but either it escapes his notice, or he declines to touch it, as beyond his powers Of course, if it be necessary to explain here that the altered vowel is acute, it needs to be added that the following vowel is grave

---

5 [1]*pûrvaçâstram nâma vikramavidhih*[1] *tasminn etad anukâryam na bhavati evam vâ sûtrârthah pûrvaçâstre*[2] *'dhyâyaprathamasûtre yâ vikramasamjño 'ktâ* [3]*sâ kampavidhâv atra*[3] *na bhavati vikramasya drdhaprayatnatvât*[4] *kampasya tadabhâvâd iti* [5]

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
ekonavinço[6] *'dhyâyah*

(1) W *strânâm api kram*, B *stre 'pi yo vikr*, O *dhiva* (2) O *rvasutre* (3) W *dhâu yatra*, G M *sâ 'tra pracayavidhau*, O *sa kampavidhayakatvam* [4] G M *tnatara syat* [5] G M add *dvâv arthau* [6] G M O *dvitiyapraçne saptamo*

1 *udâttayor ivarnokârayor yathopadeçam*[1] *yavakârabhâve sati yah svarito vihitah sa kshâipra iti samjñâyate*[2] *yathâ*[3] *v y----* *k r d h î----* *udâttayor*[4] *iti kim v a s----* *a n v----*

[1] W *-çâm*, O *-ce* [2] G M *-jñâ idvate* [3] G M om [4] W *-tta*

The examples are *vy èvâ'i 'nena* (v 3 11[3]) and *krdhî' sv àsmâ'n* (iv 7 15[7]), counter-examples, where the altered vowel was not acute, are *vásvy asi* (i 2 5[1] et al) and *ánv enam mâtâ'*, which is not, I believe, to be found in the Sanhita, the nearest thing to it is *ánv enam víprâh* (iv 6 8[3]), *ánu tvâ mâtâ'* occurs several times (i 3 10[1] et al)

All the Prâtiçâkhyas agree in calling this particular kind of circumflex by the name *kshâipra* (see note to Ath Pr iii 58)

सयकारवकारं वक्षरं यत्र स्वर्यते स्थिते पदे ऽनुदात्तपूर्वे ऽपूर्वे वा नित्य इत्येव जानीयात् ॥ २ ॥

2 But where a syllable containing a *y* or *v* is circumflexed in a fixed word, being preceded by a grave syllable, or not preceded by anything, that is to be known as *nitya*

This definition of the original circumflex accent, which belongs to the word in which it occurs, and does not merely arise as a consequence of the combination of words into phrases (although ultimately of the same nature with the *kshâipra*, just described), is a long and awkward one, but fairly attains its purpose only we do not see why the reading is not *anudâttapûrvam apûrvam vâ*, qualifying *aksharam* formally, as it does logically A syllable that has the circumflex in *pada* text (to which *sthite pade* is explained as equivalent), otherwise than enclitically after an acute, is an original (*nitya*, 'constant, invariable') circumflex The other Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath Pr iii 57) call it *jâtya*, 'natural'

The commentator defines *aksharam*, 'syllable,' in the rule as meaning *svarah*, 'vowel,' and, in fact, the use of *aksharam* here is somewhat at variance with the general custom of the treatise, which elsewhere talks of the vowel, not the syllable, as having tone (compare i 43, xiv 29) He inserts *sarvatra*, 'everywhere,' in his paraphrase, and then explains it, as if it were a part of the rule, to signify that the accent holds in *samhitâ*, *pada*, and *jatâ* text His examples are *vâyavyàm* (i 8 7[1] et al), *kanyè 'va tunnâ'* (iii 1 11[8] O omits *tunnâ*), *táto bilvàh* (ii 1 8[2]), *nyàñcam cinuyâ't* (v 5 3[2] W B add, after a pause, as if a new example, *anyancam* [B

2 *sayakâram vâ savakâram vâ 'ksharam*[1] *svara ity arthah sthite pade padakâla ity arthah yatra sthale svaryate anudâttapûrve* [2] *'pûrve*[3] *vâ pûrvâbhâve* [4] *sati*[5] *nitya eve 'ti sarvatra jânîyât sarvatre 'ti*[6] *samhitâpadajatâsv ity arthah yathâ vây-* ---- *kanye*---- *tato*---- *nyañ*---- [7] *kva*---- *kvâ*--[8]-- *iti jatâyâm tuçabdo nityâdâv uccodayavishaye*[8] *no 'dâttasvaritapara* (xiv 31) *iti nishedham nivârayati nanu*[9] *nityah katham etannishedhavishayah*[10] *udâttât paro 'nudâtta* [11] (xiv 29) *itilakshanâsambhavât*[12] *atro 'cyate varnavibhâgavelâyâm*[13] *udâttapûrvatvam*[14] *asti samâhârah svarita* (i 40) *ity ucca-*

reads -*câm*], but no such word is to be found in the Sanhitâ, and it is probably only a blundering repetition of *nyañcam*), and *kvà jágatî ca* (vii 1 4[3]), and, from the *jatâ*-text, *kvầ 'syâ 'sya kvầ* 1 *kvầ 'sya* (v 7 4[2] B has lost a part, it involves a case of *kampa*, with resulting prolongation, and use of the sign 1 see xix 3) Counter-examples are given in O only namely, of a circumflex not found in *pada*-text, *vy èvầ'i 'nena* (v 3 11[3] the MS has *vevyâi*), *drvànnah sarpíh* (iv 1 9[2], p *drú-annah*), of one which has an acute before it, *mártyâǹ ávivéça* (v 7 9[1]) and *sárvâǹ agnî n* (v 6 1[2]) We have also one of the common attempts to give a profound significance to the word *tu*, 'but,' in the rule, and, as usual, it is abortive, involving difficulties which the commentator only pretends to get rid of He says the *tu* signifies that, so far as the *nitya* circumflex etc (i e and the other varieties of the independent circumflex) are concerned, the exception laid down in rule xiv 31—namely, that the circumflex character is not retained before a following acute or circumflex—has no force But it is objected, with entire reason, that rule xiv 31 has nothing to do with the *nitya* at all, but only with the enclitic accent prescribed in rule xiv 29 His reply is, that in the condition of complete separation of sounds, there is, after all, a grave element preceded by an acute, as required in rule xiv 29, the combination of the two, by i 40, giving the circumflex character Whether this implies his recognition of the fact that the semivowel in every *nitya* syllable really represents an acute vowel, pronounced as such in an earlier stage of the language—*kvà* being equivalent to *kúa*, and *kanyầ* to *kaníâ*—admits of question He expounds *anudâttapûrve* as a descriptive instead of a possessive compound, and *apûrve* as a substantive of the same character, as if the construction were 'there being a preceding grave, or there being no preceding accent,' it is doubtless better to supply in idea *tasmin akshare*, and to render 'when that syllable is' etc The remaining bit of exposition is much corrupted in its readings, and the drift of it is not clear to me O brings it in very differently from the rest, and makes it involve an additional example, *yầjyầ'i " 'iầ'i 'nam* (ii 3 5[3], p *yầjyầ ầ' evá enam*)

---

pûrvatvât[15] *svaritasye 'ti nishedhavishayatvam anudâttaç câ 'sâu pûrvaç câ 'nudâttapûrvah* [16] *tasmin* [17]*pûrvâbhâvo 'pûrvah tasmin*[17] [18]*çûnye tu sarvatrapûrvatvât*[18] *pûrvatvaviçeshanadvayasyâ*[19] *'nyathâ*[20] *vâiyarthyât*[21] *tasmât tatra*[22] *nityasvaritatvam*[23] *eva na*[24] *samjñântaram iti vijñeyam*

[1] W B om, G M add *yatra svaryate* [2] O ins *va* [3] B om [4] G M ins *va* [5] G om [6] O *pi* [7] W B ins *anyancam* [8] G M O *-darkav*, O *shayo* [9] G M *na tu* [10] O *nish* [11] G M ins *svaritam* [12] O *laksh* [13] all MSS have the lingual *l* [14] W *-rvam* [15] W B *ucyate pu* [16] W ins *tasmat* [(17)] G M om [(18)] O *na çunya ity arthah sthite pada iti kim vy-- dr v --- anudattapurva iti kim mart---- sar----- kacid evam ucuh yaj-- --ity adi prathamnaça-karoty evakârah padasamuccaye anudattapurvatvat*, G M *çunyapurvasapurvatvat*, W *sarvatrâ*, B *bhunye* etc [19] W *purvaviveshadv*, B *purvatraviçeshanad*, O *pûrvavi* [20] O *rtatha* [21] W *thvam*. G M *thvam svat* [22] W *am*. B *tat*.

अपि चेन्नानापदस्थमुदात्तमथ चेत्सांहितेन स्वर्यते स प्रातिहतः ॥ ३ ॥

3 If, moreover, there is an acute standing in another word, then, if there be a circumflex resulting from a rule of combination, it is *prâtihata*.

The phraseology of this rule is very peculiar indeed, and its peculiarity hard to account for. The Rik and Atharva Prâtiçâkhyas distinguish only two kinds of enclitic circumflex: the *pâdavṛtta*, in which a hiatus intervenes between the acute and its successor, and the *tâirovyañjana*, in which the two are separated by consonants. According to the explanation, now, of our commentator, the present treatise sets off from the latter, as a separate class, a circumflexed syllable at the beginning of a word, following an acute at the end of the preceding word. He gives us four examples (of which, however, W. B. omit the first two, and O. the last two): *mâ' te asyâ'm* (i. 6. 12⁵), *yás tvâ hṛdâ' kīriṇâ* (i. 4. 46¹: only O. has *kîriṇâ*), *ishé tvâ* (i. 1. 1 et al.), and *tám te duçcákshâh* (iii. 2. 10²): the second word in each has the *prâtihata* circumflex. As counter-examples, we have *yán nyáñcam* (v. 5. 3²: W. gives instead *yán návam* [ii. 3. 10¹ et al.], but it does not illustrate the point arrived at, and so is doubtless a corruption of the other), to show that the following circumflex must be a result of a rule of combination; and *táyâ devátayâ* (iv. 2. 9² et al.: O. substitutes *tasmâd varupam*, which is corrupt; I have overlooked it in searching out the references, and do not know how, if it in fact represents a real citation, it ought to be amended), to show that the acute must stand in another word.

In working out this meaning for the rule, the commentator declares *api*, 'moreover,' to have the office merely of bringing down from the preceding rule the quality of going before (*pûrvatva*); *atha*, 'then,' according to him, either cuts off the continued implication of *nitya* (that is to say, means nothing at all), or else gives the value of a heading to "the being preceded by an acute standing in another word"—which is wholly to be rejected, in the first place because unnecessary (*tasmât* in the next rule having just that purpose), and in the second place because the word could at any rate make a heading only of what followed it in the rule, not of what went before.

3 *apiçabdah* [1]*pûrvatvamâtrâkarshakah*[2] *athaçabdo nityasaṁjñâvyavachedakah nânâpadasthodâttapûrvatvâdhikârako*[3] *vâ nânâpadastham aksharam udâttapûrvam*[1] *cet parato nicam sâṁhitena vidhinâ svaryate cet sa prâtihato 'tra*[4] *veditavyah* [5]*yathâ mâ.... yas....*[5] [6]*ishe.... tam....*[6]; *sâṁhitene 'ti kim*: [7]*yan....*, *nânâpadastham iti kim*, *tayâ....*[7]

(1) W. *purvaç* simply. 2 G. M. om. *tva-*, O. om. *-âtr-*. 3 O. *kâro*. 4 G. M. om. (5) W. B. om.; G. M. om. *yathâ*. (6) O. om. (7) O. *tasmadvarupam*.

If this be indeed the original intent of the rule, it would seem that, to the apprehension of the Hindu phonetists, there was difference enough between the enclitic circumflex which *te* in *tám te* assumes in *samhitâ*, having been grave in *pada*-text, and that which the *shâh* of *duçcákshâh* has in *samhitâ* as well as in *pada*, to furnish ground for a difference of classification and nomenclature.* But there are various obstacles in the way of our accepting the interpretation as satisfactory. In the first place, why ought not the same distinction to apply where the acute and circumflex are separated by a hiatus, as well as by consonants? or why, when a circumflex after an acute in the same word is called *táirovyañjana*, alike whether a hiatus or consonants intervene, should a circumflex after an acute in another word have a different name according as it is preceded by a consonant or not? In the second place, why should the rule be thrust in here, wholly out of connection with the others respecting the enclitic circumflex, and with such a frightful sacrifice of that economy of expression which the *sûtrakâra* proverbially rates so highly? for, following rule 7, a simple *nânâpadasthât tu prâtihatah* would have done the whole business, and much more unequivocally. Not one of the other treatises mixes together thus the enclitic and independent *svaritas*, when they come to be defined and named. Nor, again, does any other authority found a separate species of accent upon the basis here laid down. I have been inclined, therefore, to conjecture that the rule ought to be rendered 'when there is besides (*api*) a [preceding] acute in another word, then, provided a circumflex arises as the result of a rule of combination, it is *prâtihata*:' understanding an independent *svarita* (except a *nitya*) to be intended, whenever that *svarita* was preceded by an acute, and so held a position which would make it an enclitic *svarita* as well, and the reason for thus calling attention to it being that, as written, it is not distinguished from a mere enclitic accent.† But there are too many difficulties connected with this interpretation also to allow of its being accepted as at all satisfactory.

The Vâjasaneyi-Prâtiçâkhya (i. 118) gives a special name, *tâiro-virâma*, to the enclitic circumflex which falls in the *pada*-text upon the first syllable of the second member of a compound, under

* And this difference, it should be noted, applies in the same manner where division is made between the two parts of a compound word, for the extant Tâittirîya *pada* text, in marked contrast with those of the other Vedas, regards the *avagraha* pause as suspending, like the *avasâna*, all accentual influence, and writes *çukrá vati*, for example, in the same fashion as it writes *çukram asti*—that is to say, शुक्रऽवती । instead of शुक्रऽवती, as the rest would read.

† For example, *ghrtâír vy udyate* (iii. 1. 11[4]) and *anaçanấh svishtim* (iii. 1. 9[2]) are written precisely as if they were *ghrtâír vy udyate* and *anaçanấh svishtim*, namely, घृतैर्व्युद्यते and आनशानाः स्विष्टिम्; this is an ambiguity which is common to all the Vedic texts.

the influence of an acute on the final of the first member, and which is therefore 'separated by an intervening pause' from the tone which calls it forth Thus, the *va* of *çukra-vatî* (as written the second time in the first marginal note on p 369) has a *tâirovirâma svarita*, being marked by the ordinary *svarita*-sign Now the *vatî*, as well as the *çukra*, in this word, is to the apprehension of the present treatise (i 48) a *pada*, and hence its syllable *va* appears to fulfil all the conditions laid down in rule 2, just above, as determining a *jâtya* it is circumflexed in the *pada*-text, it is *apûrva*, or preceded by no other accent in the same *pada*, and it is *savakâra*, or contains a *v* Here, now, as it appears to me, we have the best explanation of the value, and at the same time of the position, and also, at least in part, of the phraseology, of the rule under discussion This accent needs definition, though enclitic, immediately after the *nitya*, lest it be confounded with the latter "even if all the conditions of the previous rule are fulfilled, if there is likewise an acute [preceding the syllable] in another word, and the accent is one which is produced by a rule of combination, this accent is not *nitya*, but *prâtihata*"

The most conspicuous difficulty in the way of accepting this interpretation is the fact, already referred to, that in the extant *pada*-text of the Taittirîya-Sanhitâ there is no such circumflex as is here assumed, the *va* of *çukra-vatî*, and all other syllables in like position, being grave, and marked as such But the difficulty is more apparent than real, since we have no right to assume that this *pada*-text is precisely the same with that held by the school from which the Prâtiçâkhya, or this particular rule, emanated they may have accented their *ingyas*, or separable words, after the same fashion which prevails in the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas Of more account is the awkwardness of the whole expression, and especially the use of *nânâpadastham* instead of *avagrahastham*, which would be the proper term to use in this treatise (compare i 49) in the sense here indicated But, if not completely acceptable, the interpretation has more for it and less against it, in my opinion, than either of those given above

Professor Roth, in his early digest of the teachings of the Prâtiçâkhyas respecting accent (introduction to the Nirukta, p lvii etc), identified the *prâtihata* accent with the *tâirovirâma*, but only in consequence of a misunderstanding of the character of the latter, which he supposed (ibid, p lxv) to designate an enclitic circumflex separated by consonants from its occasioning acute in a preceding word, thus giving it the same meaning which is attributed by our commentator to the *prâtihata* in the present rule And Weber (under Vâj Pr i 118), while defining the *tâirovirâma* correctly, repeats the same identification, I do not know whether as taking it incautiously from Roth, or as having arrived by conjecture at an independent interpretation of our present rule He does not allude to any difficulties as connected with the latter, nor state his identification to rest upon a different basis from that of Roth

तस्मादकारलोपेऽभिनिहतः ॥४॥

4 After such a one, in case of the loss of an *a*, it is *abhinihata*.

The word *tasmât* the comment explains as bringing down *nânâpadastham udâttam* from the preceding rule: 'after an acute occurring in another word.' But the specification (like that of *udâttayoh* in rule 1) is wholly unnecessary: rule xii 9 prescribes the circumflex and defines its conditions; here we need only to have given us the name by which it is to be called.

O has an independent exposition, but of equivalent meaning.

The examples are *sò 'bravît* (ii 1 2[1] et al.) and *tè 'bruvan* (ii 5 1[3] et al.), and a counter-example, where, as the eliding diphthong is not acute, no circumflex results, is *bhrâ'jo 'si devâ'nâm* (ii 4 3[2]).

All the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii 55) give to this circumflex the name *abhinihita*, of which our own term has the aspect of being an artificial variation.

ऊभावे प्रश्लिष्टः ॥५॥

5 Where an *û* results, it is *praçlishta*.

Rule x 17 prescribes the circumflex to which the name of *praçlishta* is here assigned, and the examples given are to be found there also, being all the instances save one which the Sanhita affords. They read in this place *sû'nnîyam iva* (vi 2 4[1]), *sû'dgâtâ* (vii 1 8[1]), *mâsû' 'ttishthan* (vii 5 2[2]: G. M. omit *mâ*), and *dikshû' 'padádhâti* (v 5 5[4]: G. M. O. omit).

The same name (or, in the Ath. Pr., *prâçlishta*) is given by the other treatises to the circumflex which results from the fusion of two short *i*'s, the first acute and the other circumflex (see note to Ath. Pr. iii 56).

पदविवृत्त्यां पादवृत्तः ॥६॥

6 Where there is a hiatus between two words, it is *pâdavṛtta*.

Here there is abrupt change, without notice, from the independent to the enclitic circumflex. The examples given are *tâ' asmât sṛshtâ'h* (ii 1 2[1]: B. omits *sṛshtâh*), *sá idhânâh* (iv 4 4[5]), and *yá*

---

4 [1]*tasmân nânâpadasthodâttât parabhûtânudâttâkârasya*[2] *lope sati yah svaritah so 'bhinihato veditavyah*[1] *yathâ so---- te ---- tasmâd iti kim bhrâjo----*

(1) O substitutes *tasmât sânhitena na svaryamanarddhe te sadakale asvarita ity arthah akâralupte ya svara âdiçyate so bhinihato nama svarito bhavati* [2] W. B. *-dâttasya*, G. M. *parabhutâd anudâttasya akarasya*

5 *ûbhâve yatra svaryate sa praçlishto veditavyah sûn---- sûd---- mâsû---- [1]dikshû----*[1]

(1) G. M. O. om.

upasádah (vi 2 4[1]), while, as counter-example, to show that the hiatus must be between two *padas*, not two parts of the same *pada*, we have *práugam ukthám* (iv 4 2[1] this implies, of course, that the *pada*-text does not treat the word as a separable one)

The Rik Pr (iii 9,10) calls this accent *vâivrtta*, and there is nothing in its definition or in that of the Vâj Prât (i 119) which should limit the accent to the case of a hiatus between two *padas*, or deprive the *u* of such a word as *prauga* of its right to rank as a *pâdavrtta* See the note to the next rule

उदात्तपूर्वस्तैरोव्यञ्जनः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Where an acute precedes, it is *tâirovyañjana*

The form of this rule, again, is almost unaccountably peculiar The term *tâirovyañjana* means 'with consonant-intervention,' and all the other treatises (see note to Ath Pr iii 62) define the accent in accordance with this, as being one in which the circumflex is separated by intervening consonants from the occasioning acute Here, to be sure, such a definition would hardly answer, as there is a single word in the Sanhita, *praugam*, in which a vowel is regarded as having *tâirovyañjana*, although there is no consonant between it and the acute But why specify *udâttapûrva*, 'preceded by an acute,' in this rule, when it was just as necessary in rule 6? The commentator says that, as the implication has been made all along, its repetition here is for the purpose of signifying that the acute is now to be understood to be in the same word with the circumflex That may satisfy him, but is not calculated to content us If *nânâpadastham udâttam* was implied in rule 6 from above, then *padavivrttyâm* should have been simply *vivrttyâm* Things would be made much better by putting rule 6 after rule 7 then we should be able to give *udâttapûrva* in rule 7 a meaning, as recalling to mind the actual cause of these two accents, and rule 6 would stand as an exception to the other and more general statement, pointing out a class of cases in which, though depending on a preceding acute, another name was applied to the accent

The commentator's examples are *yuñjánty asya* (vii 4 20), *vásvy*

---

6 *padayor vivrttih padavivrttih*[1] *tasyâm yah svaryate sa pâdavrtto veditavyah*[2] *yathâ*[3] *tâ*--- *sa*---- *ya*---- *vivrttir vyaktir*[4] *ity arthah padayor iti kim pra*-----

[1] W B O om [2] B *bhavati* [3] in O only [4] B *vyâptatirikta*

7 *udâttapûrvâdhikâre sati punar atra tathakathanâd*[1] *ekapadasthodâttaviçesho*[2] *'vagamyate*[3] *tasmâd ekapadasthodâttapûrvo yah svaritah sa*[4] *tâirovyañjano veditavyah yathâ*[5] *yuñj*---- *vas*----- *sa*---- *tad*---- *pra*---- *tam*- ---

[1] G M *kath*, O *tu k* [2] G M *-sthityavi*, O *-sthatvavi-* [3] O *gam-* [4] O *asâu* [5] in O only

asi (i 2 5² et al), *sá índro 'manyata* (vii 1 5⁵ G M omit *sa*), *tád áçvo 'bhavat* (v 3 12¹), *praúgam* (iv 4 2¹), and *tám tváshtá' " 'dhattu* (i 5 1³ G M omit the last word) It is very odd—but, I presume, merely accidental—that in every one of these cases (except *praugam*) the vowel which finally shows the circumflex is not of the same word with the acute, but belongs to another word which has been combined with its predecessor, and, after the combination, gets the circumflex by the general rules xiv 29,30 (for the commentator has expressly denied under rule x 12 that the initial grave *a* of *asya*, for example, receives the circumflex in virtue of its combination with the enclitic circumflex *ti* of *yuñjanti*) I do not see why, in the first two cases, at any rate, the circumflex is not *prâtihata*, according to the commentator's explanation of the meaning of that term, and should even incline to conjecture that these are the examples selected and current for the present rule before the erroneous interpretation of rule 3 was established

No one of the other Prâtiçâkhyas limits *tâirovyañjana* to an enclitic circumflex following its acute in the same word (see note to Ath Pr iii 62), it is quite an oversight, therefore, that the St Petersburg lexicon gives the term only this restricted meaning (perpetuating Roth's original error, referred to above, in the note to rule 3)

इति स्वारनामधेयानि ॥ ८ ॥

8 These are the names of the circumflex accents

The commentator simply gives examples for each accent, in part new, in part the same with those furnished under the rules defining each namely, for the *kshâipra* (omitted in G M), *abhy àsthât* (iv 2 8¹) and *ádhvaryó veh* (vi 4 3⁴ this is a blunder, there being no *kshâipra* in the phrase, B O read instead *adhvaryúh* [vi 2 9⁴ et al], which does not mend the matter), for the *nitya*, *vâyavyàm* (i 8 7¹ et al] and *kvà' 'sya* (v 7 4² G M have *kva* simply), for the *prâtihata*, *sá te lokáh* (v 7 26 G M omit *lokah*) and *yát tvâ kruddháh* (i 5 4² G M omit *kruddhah*), for the *abhinihata*, *sò 'bravît* (ii 1 2¹ et al), for the *praçlishta*, *sû'dgâtâ* (vii 1 8¹), for the *pâdavrtta*, *tá enam* (ii 3 11⁴ W reads, blunderingly, *tam nemîm* [ii 6 11¹], and B substitutes *sá idhânáh*, iv 4 4⁵), and for the *tâirovyañjana*, *máma nâ'ma* (i 5 10¹)

क्षैप्रनित्ययोर्दृढतरः ॥ ९ ॥

---

8 *ity etâni sapta svaritanâmadheyâny*[1] *âkhyâtâni*[2] *yathâ* [3]*abhy---- adhv---- iti kshâiprah*[3] *vây---- kvâ---- iti nityah sa---- yat---- iti prâtihatah so---- ity abhinihatah sûd- --- iti praçlishtah ta---- iti pâdavrttah mama---- iti tâirovyañjanah*

1 W *mâny*, B *-yâni svaritanâm* 2 O *vyâkh* (3) G M om

9 In the *kshâipra* and *nitya*, the effort is firmer

The commentator makes very short work of the remaining rules of the chapter, and we can afford to do the same, as they teach us nothing of value

अभिनिहते च ॥१०॥

10 As also in the *abhinihata*

The commentator says that *ca* in this rule is used in the sense of secondary adjunction (*anvâcaya*), and so signifies that the effort of utterance in the *abhinihata* is *drdha*, 'firm,' merely—a less degree than the *drdhatara*, 'firmer,' or 'quite firm,' of the preceding rule The same may be also inferred, he adds, from the fact that the *abhinihata* is made the subject of a separate rule, instead of being included in rule 9, with the other two

प्रश्लिष्टप्रातिहतयोर्मृदुतरः ॥११॥

11 In the *praçlishta* and *prâtihata*, it is gentler

Nothing is to be inferred from its association here as to the real character of the *prâtihata* This rule and its successor were referred to under i 46, but for no intelligibly useful purpose

तैरोव्यञ्जनपादवृत्तयोरल्पतरो ऽल्पतरः ॥१२॥

12 In the *tâirovyañjana* and *pâdavrtta*, it is feebler

---

9 *kshâipre nitye ca prayatno*[1] *drdhatarah kâryah*[2]

[1] W *tna*, B *-tni*, O *yatno* [2] W B om

10 *anvâcaye vartamânaç cakâro drdhamâtram bodhayati · abhinihate*[1] *ca*[2] *prayatno*[3] *drdhah*[4] *syât na tu drdhatarah iti prthaksûtrârambhâd api*[5] *pratîyate*

[1] B *hite* (as also in the rule) [2] O om [3] G M insert *mrdutarah*, and rule 12 [4] O *dhataram* [5] W *abhi*, B om

11 *praçlishte prâtihate ca prayatno mrdutarah kâryah*

12 *tâirovyañjane pâdavrtte* [1]*ca prayatno 'lpatarah syât*[1] [2]*yady apy*[3] *alpamrdudrdhabhâvas*[4] *tatro 'ktas tathâ 'pi*[5] *dîpavad venupatravad iti çikshânurodhât*[6] *komalaçirashatvam*[7] *sarvatra vijñeyam*[8] [2]

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane viñço[9] *'dhyâyah.*

(1) O *cá 'lpataram karanam bhavati* (2) W om [3] G M O om [4] G M ins *tatra* [5] M *'pi 'ti* [6] B *kshithânurodhoktâu* [7] B *âlpaçisk*, G M *kâivalyaçirastv* [8] O *jñeyam yathâ yuvâ kavi* [9] G M, O *dvitiyapraçne ashtamo*

Alpatara, 'feebler,' is doubtless meant to signify a still less degree of force of utterance than *mrdutara*, 'gentler.'

To the commentator, his Çikshâ appears to be a higher authority than the Prâtiçâkhya, at least in this part, and he adds that, although the qualifications 'feeble, gentle, firm' are here attributed to the accents in question, yet, in accordance with what the Çikshâ says, "like a candle, like a rush-leaf" (? unintelligible without the context), it is to be understood that there is softheadedness (?) in them all alike. And O adds an example, *yúvâ kavíh* (i 3 14[1]).

CHAPTER XXI

CONTENTS 1–9, division of consonants in syllabication, 10–11 *pracaya* accent, 12–13, *yamas* or nasal counterparts, 14, *nâsikya*, 15–16, *svarabhakti*.

व्यञ्जनं स्वराङ्गम् ॥ १ ॥

1. The consonant is adjunct of a vowel.

This brief principle calls forth a long discussion. Reference is first made (except in G. M.) to rule xxiv 5, as, by its requirement of a comprehension of *anga*, 'adjunct' (literally 'limb, member'), creating a necessity for the present precept (and for those that are to follow). Objection is then at once taken to the principle: if, in such cases as *kûpa* and *yûpa* (and G. M. add yet other words as illustrations), it is the consonant that indicates the difference of meaning, ought not the vowel, rather, to be considered as adjunct

---

1 [1] °*vyañjanam svarâñgam bhavati çvâso nâdo 'ñgam eva ca* (xxiv 5) *iti vijñeyatvena*[2] *vidhânâd ayam ârambhah nanu*[3] *kûpo yûpa*[4] *ityâdâu vyañjanam evâ 'rthaviçeshabodhakam*[5] *iti svaro vyañjanâñgam kim na*[6] *syât ucyate vyañjanam kevalam avasthâtum na çaknoti kim tu sâpeksham*[7] *svaras tu nirapekshah*[8] *sâpekshanirapekshayor nirapeksham eva viçishtam âcakshate prekshâvantah viçishtapratyañgatvam*[9] *aviçishtasyâi*[10] *'va kim ca svaravâiçishtyabodhakam anyad api vidyate*[11]

durbalasya yathâ râshtram harate[12] *balavân nrpah*
durbalam vyañjanam tadvad dharate[13] *balavânt svarah*[14]

[15]*kim ca çikshâvyâkhyâne*

yah svayam râjate tam tu svaram âha patañjalih
uparisthâyinâ tena vyañgam vyañjanam ucyate[15]

svarâs tu[16] *brâhmanâ jñeyâ ityâdi*

udâttaç câ 'nudâttaç ca[17] *svaritaç ca svarâs trayah*[18]
[19]*hrasvo dîrghah pluta iti*[19] *kâlato*[20] *niyamâ*[21] *aci*[22] *'ti*[23]

of the consonant? The answer given is, that a consonant is incapable of standing alone, and so is dependent, while a vowel is independent, and that, as between a dependent and an independent, the enlightened regard the independent as superior, and it belongs to the inferior to be adjunct to the superior Moreover, there is found also another proof of the superiority of the vowel, in the verse "as a mighty monarch takes possession of the realm of a weak one, so the mighty vowel takes possession of the weak consonant" The beginning of another verse is added "the vowels are to be known as belonging to *brahman*" But between this part of a verse and the whole verse that precedes, G M insert another, which is asserted to come from "the exposition of the Çikshâ," and which gives a highly imaginative derivation for *svara*, 'vowel,' and *vyañjana*, 'consonant' "Patanjali styled that a vowel which *shines* by *itself* [*sva-ra* from SVA-*yam* RÂ*jate*] the consonant is so called as being imperfect [*vyañjana* from *vyañga*, literally 'limbless'] without [? the expression needs mending, to bring out a desirable sense] the other following it" Then all start together upon a new argument for the superiority of the vowel with yet another verse, which is actually found in the known *pâninîya* Çiksha (verse 23, see Weber's Indische Studien, iv 353) "acute, grave, and circumflex, the three accents, and short, long, and protracted, these, in regard to quantity, are the necessary characteristics of the vowels," which shows that acute tone and so on are attributes of vowels only, and of consonants in virtue of their being adjuncts of vowels

---

svarânâm evo 'dâttâdayo dharmâh [24] *vyañjanânâm*[25] *tu*[26] *tadañgatayâ*[27] *vyañjanam ardhamâtram*[28] *svaraç ca mâtrâkâlah. tayoh samdhir*[29] *adhyardhamâtrah*[30] *ity evam dirghakâlah prasaktah tatpratishedhârtham vyañjanam svarâñgam ity uktam svarasamsrshtasya*[31] *vyañjanasya svarakâla eva kâlo drutavrttâu*[32] *na tu* [33]*svarasyâi 'va*[33] *sarvatre*[34] *'ty arthah* [35]*drutavrttâv iti kim* [35] *hrasvârdhakâlam vyañjanam* (i 37) *iti*[36] *vyartham syâd iti brûmah yathâ*[37] *kshirodakasamparke*[38] *kshîrasyâi 'vo 'palabdhir no 'dakasya tathâ svaravyañjanasamparke*[39] *svarasyâi*[40] *'vo 'palabdhir*[41] *vâiçishtyam* [42]

[1] O ins *svarasya 'ngam svarangam* [(2)] G M *svara* [3] G M *na* [4] G M *-pas supah kalah valah balah phala* [5] O *-sha iti bo-* [6] O om [7] W B *-kshâ* O *sâksheyam* [8] O *-kshakah* [9] G M *shtam svaram prat-*, O *shtam prat-* [10] G M *-sya vyañjanasyai* [11] G M *asti* [12,13] G M *harita* [14] G M *-ra iti* [(15)] in G M only [16] G M *ca* [17] B om [18] G M put before *svarâs* [(19)] G M O *hrasvadirghaplutâç cai 'va* [20] G M *lako* [21] G M *-yata* O *-yatâs* [22] W *çrayi*, G M *api*, O *tate* [23] G M ins *vacanât* [24] G M ins *na tu* [25] O *-janam* [26] W *tu dam*, G M om [27] O *tadharmatayâ* [28] G M *-trakam* [29] O *sam* [30] B G M O *ardham*, G *trika*, M *traka* [31] W *rasamashti* [32] W *dut*, B *dut*, O *drgatatau* [(33)] W *svârah sparçasyâi 'va*, O om [34] B *iasye* [(35)] B om, W *dut-*, O *drtav* [36] G M om [37] G M om [38] G M *rkaih*, O *kshirâudakesampa* [39] G M *rkâis* [40] W *sparçasyâi* [41] W O *bdhir*, B *bdhâir* [42] B *vaçishtaya*, G M *shyam*

Next we pass to the consideration of another reason why the principle stated in the rule needed to be laid down The consonant (by i 37) has half a *mora* of quantity, and a vowel has [for example] a *mora* their combination, then, would seem to have a *mora* and a half, and so would be liable to be understood as of long quantity this untoward conclusion is avoided by the present rule, which implies that in fluent utterance the quantity of the vowel belongs in all cases to the combination of consonant and vowel, and not to the vowel alone The specification "in fluent utterance" (literally, 'in running action') is made in order to save the significance of rule i 37

Finally, the superiority of the vowel is once more inferred from the fact that, when it is combined with a consonant, it alone is perceptible, just as, when milk and water are mingled, the milk alone is perceived, and not the water

तत्परस्वरम् ॥ २ ॥

2. And it belongs to the following vowel

The commentator explains *parasvaram* as a descriptive compound (*karmadhâraya*), governed by *bhajate* understood, such an ellipsis, however, is so violent as to be hardly admissible, and the word is perhaps better taken as a possessive (*bahuvrihi*), somewhat anomalously used The occasion of the rule, we are told, is the doubt which is liable to arise as to when the consonant—which, owing to its having the vowel as a superior, is unable to stand by itself—is an adjunct of the preceding, and when of the following vowel A single phrase is quoted as example, namely *imân eva lokân upadhâya* (v 5 5[3] O omits the last word)

This is the leading and introductory principle in all the Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath Pr i 55), it is greatly restricted in its application by the following rules

अवसितं पूर्वस्य ॥ ३ ॥

3 A consonant *in pausâ* belongs to the preceding vowel

The commentator explains *avasitam* as meaning 'standing at the end of a *pada*,' and gives as examples *ûrk* (i 2 2[2] et al W has instead *rk* [iv 7 9[1] et al], and O has *vâk* [i 3 9[1] et al]), *vashat*

2 *svarapradhânatayâ kevalam avasthatum asahamânam*[1] [2]*vyañjanam kadâ pûrvasyâ 'ñgam*[2] [3]*kadâ parasyâ 'ñgam*[3] *iti samdehe*[4] *vyavasthâpayati tad añgabhûtam*[5] *vyañjanam parasvaram bhajate yathâ*[6] *imân---- paraç câ 'sâu svaraç ca parasvarah* [7] *tam*[8] *svaraparam*[9]

[1] O om [2] G M om [3] W O om, G M *kadacid apar* [4] G M *ham* [5] W *anç abh-*, O *eyasutratam* [6] B. om [7] W ins *param svari* [8] O om [9] G M O om

(ii 2 12[4] et al), *tat* (*passim* given by G M only), and *havih* (i 2 4[1] et al)

This principle, of course, is without exception in its application It is either stated or implied in the rules of the other treatises (see note to Ath Pr i 57)

संयोगादि ॥ ४ ॥

4 Also the first consonant of a group

That is to say, as the commentator points out, of a group consisting of either two consonants or more than two The "also" (*ca*) expressed in the next rule is declared to be implied here also, and to prescribe adjunction to the preceding vowel The examples given are *yajñân vyâdiçat* (vi 6 11[1]) and *apsv antah* (i 4 45[2] et al but G M substitute *apsv agne* [iv 2 11[3]], and W has the corrupt reading *açvatah*) If, now, we had only to take the groups of consonants as they stand in the ordinary text, and divide them, the application of this and of the remaining rules for syllabication would be simple enough, but we are required to apply also the rules for duplication etc as found in chapter xiv, and to make the insertions required by the rules of the fifth (v 32,33) and the present chapter (12–16), which puts quite a different face upon the matter In fact, in the examples furnished, *nt* is the only group which is divided *n-t* without farther ceremony, *çr* becomes and is divided *ç-gr*, *nvy*, in like manner, *n nvy*, *psv* is expanded into *p-phsv*, and *jñ* into *j-jñ* (writing the *yama*, as I have done elsewhere, with a straight line above the letter), where, by the action of the next rule, two consonants go to the preceding vowel The class of groups consisting of two consonants only, and such consonants as (by xiv 23) are not liable to duplication, is the only one of which the division is settled by the present rule alone it contains (in the Taittirîya-Sanhitâ) thirty-nine groups, such as *nt*, *tth*, *pp*, *yy*, *my*, *çç*

The other treatises hold this same principle, and teach it in an equivalent manner (see Ath Pr i 56 and note)—save that the Rik Pr (i 5, xviii 18) allows the letter to be adjoined to either the preceding or the following syllable

---

3 *avasitam padântavanti*[1] *vyañjanam* [2]*pûrvasya svarasyâ 'ngam*[2] [3]*syât yathâ*[4] *ârk vashat tat*[5] *havih*[5]

[1] G M *antarv* [(2)] G M *purvasvarâñgam* [(3)] B om [4] O om [5] W O om

4 [1]*dvayor bahûnâm*[1] *vâ samyogo bhavati*[4] *tasya samyogasyâ* [2]*'di*[5] *vyañjanam* [6] *pûrvasvarasyâ*[7] *'ngam*[1] *bhavati*. [8]*yathâ*[9]. *yajñân*---- *apsv*---- *parusâtre cakârah*[8] [10]*pûrvasvarâñgatvâbodhaka*[11] *ity atrâ 'pi tat*[12] *labhyate*[10]

[(1)] B om [2] G M om [3] W *varnânâm*, G M *saŷyogânâm* [4] G M ins *yadi* [5] G M ins *yad* [6] G M ins *tat* [7] W *pûrvasya*, O *-svarâ* [(8)] O om [9] G M om [(10)] W O om [11] G M *svarasyâ 'ng-*, B *-ngam bo-* [12] G M om

The manuscripts of the commentary are more than usually defective in this neighborhood B has lost the present rule, with something of what precedes and follows it, O omits the next rule, with passages before and after, W has done the same, to a somewhat less extent, but rule 5 and the lacking part of its comment were apparently restored on the margin of W's original, and its copyist has put them in in the wrong place, next before rule 6

परेण चासंहितम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 And one that is not combined with the following vowel

The comment supplies the word *svarena*, 'vowel,' as that with which *parena* here agrees, and the whole interpretation is constructed accordingly The meaning is, then, that (with the exceptions to be further specified in the following rules) only the final member of a group of consonants is to be adjoined to the following vowel, the rest belonging to that which precedes By way of illustration is given merely *tat savituh* (i.5 6[4] et al) a most insufficient and ill-chosen example, since, in the final form of the group *ts*, only one consonant goes with the preceding syllable thus, *t-ths* But the commentator is obliged to spend his strength, and vainly, in endeavoring to refute an obvious objection to the rule itself, which he thus states "well, but then the foregoing rule is meaningless, since by this one also the quality of adjunction to the preceding vowel is assured to the consonant that begins a group" And he replies, "you must not think that for, in such cases as *maryaçrîh* (iv 1 2[5] et al) and *arvâ 'si* (i 7 8[1] et al), in which the *y* and *v* are doubled after *r* by rule xiv 4, the former *y* or *v* is by the present rule made an adjunct of the preceding vowel, but the *r*, by rule 7 below, would become an adjunct of the following vowel and that is impossible, since no such pronunciation ever takes place So, as one or the other must needs be annulled, the question arises which is to be annulled, and here rule 4 comes in to settle the question"

This is not a very acceptable exposition, although it in a manner involves the true relations Rule 4 is not meant as a safeguard against the misapplication of following precepts, but is a fundamental principle, with reference to which the present rule stands in a subordinate position, and the two must be understood as if they read "the first member of a group belongs to the preceding vowel, and, along with it, such other members as are not immediately combined with the following vowel" The former principle obtains everywhere, without exception, to the latter, rules 7–9

---

5 [1]*parena*[2] *svarenâ 'saṁhitam*[3] *asaṁyuktam*[4] *vyañjanam*[5] *pûrvasvarâṅgam bhavati*[1] *yathâ*[6] *tat----* *nanu tarhi pûrvasûtram anarthakam saṁyogâdibhûtasyâ*[7] *'pi vyañjanasyâ 'nenâi 'va pûrvasvarâṅgatvasiddheh mâi 'vam mansthâh*[8] *maryaçrîh arvâ 'si ity atra yavakârayo rephât param ca* (xiv

establish very important and extensive classes of exceptions If the mode of statement adopted in the treatise is open to some objection, we cannot help it, the slight inaccuracy is perhaps a consequence of the general prevalence of the doctrine of rule 4, to which its successor is added as an extension peculiar to this school

No one of the other Prâtiçâkhyas recognizes any such principle as this those of the Rik (i 5, xviii 18) and Atharvan (i 58) add to the initial consonant of a group only the first of a following pair which is the result of duplication, that of the White Yajus including further (i 104,105) the other one of the pair, provided a mute follows Its sway is, as already remarked, much more limited than would be thought at first sight, because rule 7 establishes a different usage for the immense class of groups of which a semivowel stands as final member, and rule 9 for the much smaller but yet important class in which a spirant stands last, or followed by a semivowel Its general effect is to attach to the following vowel only such consonants or groups as could begin a word, leaving the rest to belong to the foregoing syllable There seems to be need of illustrating, more fully than the commentator has deigned to do, the sphere of its application

This is, in consonant-groups originally of two members, to

1 Groups in which a mute is doubled (or its corresponding non-aspirate prefixed to it, as will be understood hereafter without special remark) after a surd spirant (*χ* or *φ*, xiv 9,15), *l* (xiv 2,3), or *r* (xiv 4,15), the first member of the group remaining unchanged thus, *χk-k*, *lk-k*, *rk-k* These are twenty-seven in number, and to them may be added *ry-y*, *rl-l*, *rv v*, which, by the final specification of rule 7, follow the same mode of division In regard to these, the usage as fixed by our treatise is the same with that sanctioned by the rest, as already mentioned

2 Groups in which a mute, or *v*, is doubled before a mute of another series thus, *kk-c*, *vv-n* Of these there are fifty-one in the Sanhitâ

3 The same, but with the addition (by xxi 12) of *yama* before the final member thus, *gg-g̅n* Twenty-three groups

4 Groups in which the initial spirant (sibilant) is doubled, and also the following mute (by xiv 9), only the last of all going to the following syllable thus, *çç-c* Thirteen groups

5 The same, but with *yama* thus, *çcp-p̅n* (*çm*) Six groups

6 Groups in which *h* is doubled before a nasal, with *nâsikya* (by xxi 14 but see the note to that rule, for a different interpretation) thus, *hh-ⁿn* Three groups only

Against these one hundred and twenty-six groups, growing out

---

4) *iti dvitve* [9] *krte prathamayavakârayoh parena câ 'sanhitam*[10] *ity anena pûrvasvarâṅgatvam*[11] *prâptam*[12]. *rephasya tu*[13] *n â 'ntasthâparam asavarnam* (xxi.7) *ity anena parasvarâṅgatvam*[14] *prâptam*[15] *tac câ 'çakyam tathoccâranâsambhavât anyatarabâdhe*[16] *kartavye sati kim vâ bâdhyam*[17] *iti samdehah*[18]

of original simple pairs, there are eighty like *k-ky* (from *ky*) and *k-khsh* (from *ksh*), in which, by rules 7 and 9, only the initial consonant of the finally resulting group goes with the preceding vowel.

When, now, the pairs here rehearsed come to be extended to triplets by the addition of a third member, if that member be a semivowel, or a spirant (sibilant) following a mute, the point of division remains just where it was before. And so also, of course, in the like extension of the groups mentioned under rule 4, above, as undergoing no change in the *varnakrama*. Thus, *ggr* (*g-gr*) is divided like *gg* (*g-g*), *çcy* (*çç-cy*) like *çc* (*çç-c*), *ñksh* (*ñ-khsh*) like *ñk* (*ñ-k*), and *rks* (*rk-khs*) like *rk* (*rk-k*). And the very great majority (one hundred and fifty-four) of the groups of three consonants occurring in the Sanhitâ have a semivowel as their final member; with final sibilant there are only seven.

If, on the other hand, double groups are extended to triplets by appending a mute, either non-nasal or nasal (which happens in thirty one cases), the point of division is, by the operation of the present rule, shifted toward the end of the group. Thus, we have

1 *ñ-k*, but *ñk-t*, two groups; and *ñ-ch*, but *ñj-jñ*, two groups;
2 *rk-k*, but *rkk-c*, five groups; and *rj-j*, but *rjj-jm*, five groups;
3 *dd-gh*, but *ddgh-ghn*, two groups;
4 *sst-t*, but *sstt-tn*, two groups;

which are extensions of the groups of two members already treated of, and advance the division only one point. But further, groups ending in a sibilant, and falling under rule 9, below, and those which by rule 15 have *svarabhakti*, exhibit, when a mute is added, a still greater transference forward of the point of division, and we have

5 *k-khs* (*ks*), but *kkhst-t* (*kst*), four groups; and *k-khsh* (*ksh*), but *kkhshp-pm* (*kshm*), five groups; and, finally,

6 *rr-sh* (*rsh*), but *rshsht-t* (*rsht*), and *rr-ç*, but *rççp-pm* (*rçm*), three groups.

In the yet further extension to groups of four members, the same principles prevail. There are found nineteen such groups in which the additional letter, being a semivowel, has no effect upon the division; and only three in which the division is altered by an added mute. These last are *ñkhsht-tn* (*ñkshn*), from *ñkhsh*, *kkhsht-tn* (*kkshn*), from *k-khsh* (*kksh*), and *nthst-t* (*ntst*), from *n-ths* (*nts*).

Finally, the only two groups of five consonants occurring in the



Sanhitâ (*ntstr* and *tstry*) are formed by added semivowels, and so do not come under the further action of the present rule

G M read *asâñhitam* instead of *asañhitam* in the rule

अनुस्वारः स्वरभक्तिश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti*

By G M, this rule is divided into two, *anusvârah* and *svarabhaktiç ca* (while, on the other hand, T reads *anusvârasvarabhaktyoç ca*), and such a division is noted, if not accepted, in the comment, by all the manuscripts, which say "of this rule (*svarabhaktiç ca*) is made a setting-apart, although the prescription is identical (with that made in the other rule, *anusvârah*)" And the object of thus separating what is confessed properly to belong together is stated to be "to bring about the adjunction of *svarabhakti*, in some cases, to the following vowel," on the authority of a verse which is quoted, to the effect that "the knowing man should connect with its predecessor (?) the *bhakti* that follows a short vowel, and in *rtasya dhârshadam* the *bhakti* is said to do as it pleases," but G M substitute for the latter half of the verse "to it should be assigned one *mora*, also before a pause and in cases of hiatus" The whole matter is exceedingly obscure, or quite unintelligible, without aid from the context of the quoted verse The words cited as examples are not found in the Sanhita, but they occur in the Rig-Veda (at i 143 7), and also in the Taittirîya-Brahmana (i 2 1[12]), where the *svarabhakti* has assumed the form of a full vowel, and the word reads *dhârushadam* It looks as if the commentators had set out to divide into two rules what they nevertheless have to acknowledge to be really only one, for the purpose of interpreting into the latter half of it, when set by itself, a license to the element in question to be treated either way, but, as they have not fully carried out their intention, I have preferred to retain the unity of the rule It is quoted, we may further remark, under rule i 34, in all the manuscripts of the comment, apparently without any thought of a division

---

6 *cakârah samuccayakathanadvara*[1] *pûrvasvarâñgatvâkarshakah* [2]*anusvârah*[3] *pûrvasvaram*[4] *bhajate*[5] *yathâ*[6] *añç* - [2] *svarabhaktiç ca pûrvasvaram*[7] *bhajate yathâ*[8] *qârh*- - - *vidhâu*[2] *samâne*[10] *sûtrasyâ 'sya prthakkaranam*[11] *kvacit svarabhakteh*[12] *parâñgatvam*[13] *âpâdayitum*[14] *tathâ hi*

[15]*svarâd dhrasvât*[15] *parâm bhaktim pracayatvam nayed*[16] *budhah*
[17]*rtasya dhârshadam ce 'ti svatantrâ bhaktir ucyate*[17]

[1] B *-ra*, G M *-thanâd vâ*, O *-dvât* (2) G M put after *anusvârah*, as its comment, giving all the rest as comment to *svarabhaktiç ca* as a separate rule [3] O om [4] W G M O *svarângam* [5] G M *syât* [6] G M O om [7] O *svar-* [8] G M O om [9] O *samavi-* [10] O *-na*, G M add *anusvâra svarabhaktiç ce 'ti* [11] B *-kkâr* [12] O *prthagnaktâuh* [13] W B G M *padâ* [14] W B *datum* (15) B *svarânga hr-* [16] G M *na ced* (17) G M substitute *tasyâ mâtrâ bhaved ekâ virâme ca vivrttishu*, O adds (?) from comment to next rule

Anusvâra appears here once more with the distinct value of a consonantal element following the vowel—and yet not as a full consonant, else it would fall under rule 4 above, and would require no separate treatment. The treatise is not so explicit as were to be desired in defining what is to be done with it in syllabication, but I presume we may infer that it does not count as *saṃyogâdi* at all, but only as if an affection of the preceding vowel, and hence, that all the groups which it introduces are to be divided as if it were not there; that *ṅcc*, for example, is to be made into *ṅçç-c*, *ṅsm* into *ṅssp-pm*, and *ṅstr* into *ṅsst tr*. The example given by the commentator is *aṅçunâ te* (i. 2. 6), but it is an ill-chosen one, and quite worthless, as, in any view of the nature and treatment of *anusvâra*, no question could arise as to the division *aṅ-çunâ*.

For *svarabhakti*, see the concluding rules of this chapter (xxi. 15,16). The example given is *gârhapatyah* (i. 6. 7[1] et al.), which we are to read and divide *gâr-ha-pat-tyah*.

नान्तस्थापरमसवर्णम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. But not a consonant that is followed by a semivowel, if dissimilar with it.

The negative here signifies a direct reversal of the implication, as it denotes a denial of adjunction to the preceding vowel, and hence necessarily involves adjunction to the one that follows, since the consonant cannot stand by itself. "Dissimilar" is simply explained by *vilakshana*, 'of diverse characteristics, different;' it excludes from the operation of the rule the doubled semivowel itself, and would also exclude the nasal semivowel into which *n* and *m* are converted before *l*, and *m* before *y* and *v* (v. 26,28), if these occurred where the rule could apply, which is not the case.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *adhyavasâya divaḥ* (vi. 1. 5[1], i. e. *ad-dhya-*), *madhumiçrena* (v. 2. 8[6] et al., i. e. *miç-çre-*), *açlonayâ* (vi. 1. 6[7], i. e. *aç-çlo-*), and *ishe tvâ* (i. 1. 1 et al., i. e. *i-shet-tvâ*): they are not to be commended as at all fully illustrating the wide range of application of the rule. This has been sufficiently set forth above, under rule 5. It helps to determine the division of one-third of the groups of two consonants, of four-fifths of those of three, of six-sevenths of those of four, and of all those of five—or of four-sevenths of the whole number of consonant

---

7. *nakârah pûrvasvarâṅgatvavyâvartakaḥ. antasthâparam vyañjanam tasyâ antasthâyâ asavarnam vilakshanam pûrvasvarâṅgam na bhavati: arthât parasvarâṅgam* [1]*tad iti veditavyam*[1] [2]*svatu sthâtum açakyatvât*[2]. *yathâ*[3] *adhy-.... madh-.... açl-..... ishe.... antasthâ parâ yasmât tad antasthâparam. asavarnam iti kim: pari-...*

(1) G. M. *iti vijñeyam*; O. om. (2) O. puts at end of comment on preceding rule; B. *svaram vinâ sthâ*. [3] O. om.

groups By way of further examples, we may cite the two groups of five, they are *vi-yu yâtthst tryas sya* (ii 6 5[4] [5]) and *ab bru-vanthst-trî-kâ-mâ* (vi 1 6[5])

But if the commentator's direct illustration of the rule is scanty, his counter-illustration is yet less satisfactory To establish the necessity of the specification *asavarnam*, 'dissimilar,' he cites only *parivâyyam amnita* (v 4 11[3]) Such cases as this, however, are rather covered by the fundamental rule *samyogadi* (xxi 4), and the application of the present one is to the groups in which a semi-vowel is doubled after *r*, and which we are to read *ry-y*, *rl-l*, *rv-v*, while, on the other hand, in the half-dozen groups in which two different semi-vowels follow a mute, both of them, along with the preceding mute, go to the succeeding vowel thus, *nish-shvañ-ñvyârc-chat* (ii 3 2[6]), *a-vit-trya-va-tu* (i 8 22[1]), and *ap-hâd-dvrî-hîn* (ii 3 1[3])

नासिक्याः ॥ ८ ॥

8 Nor the nose sounds

The "nose-sounds" are here again (as under ii 49) defined as the *yamas* (xxi 12,13) only, but there is no reason why we should not regard the *nâsikya* (xxi 14) as likewise included (see the note on rule 14) The examples given are also of *yamas* only *rukmam upa dadhati* (v 2 7[1] et al O has *rukmam* only) and *râjñe sthâ-rah* (v 5 11 O substitutes *svarâjñe*, v 6 21) The groups, in their full form, are read and divided *kk-km* and *jj-jñ* An example of the *nâsikya* would be *vahh-"ni-tu-mam* (i 1 4[1])

The Vâj Pr (i 103) reckons the *yama* to the preceding vowel, neither of the other treatises says anything about it

स्पर्शश्चोष्मपर ऊष्मा चेत्परश्च ॥ ९ ॥

9 Nor a mute that is followed by a spirant provided the following spirant is likewise in the same case

The first *ca* (translated 'nor' here), the commentator says, effects the connection of the rule with its predecessor; the second (rendered 'likewise') implies adjunction to the following vowel This is not very lucid, for the two things are really equivalent to one another And in the further exposition, the *parah* appears (the readings are not consistent or clear) to be taken as signifying *parasvarâñgam*, but this cannot well be correct. The phraseology of the rule, indeed, is very peculiar, and I do not see how it is to be accounted for unless we may conjecture that the proviso *ûshmâ cet paraç ca* is a later addition, made after it had been noticed that the more general statement *sparçaç co 'shmaparah*

8 *nâsikyâ*[1] *yamâḥ*[2] *parasvaram*[3] *bhajante. yathâ*[4]. *rukmam* ---- *râjñe* ---

[1] B om [2] G M *yah* [3] W *svaraparam* [4] G M O om

included too much The meaning is clear that a spirant which itself belongs to the following syllable, as being either directly combined with the vowel of the latter (xxi 5) or followed only by a semivowel before that vowel (xxi 7), carries with it a preceding mute, but if, on the other hand, it be cut off from the succeeding vowel by a mute, so as itself to belong to the antecedent syllable, a mute before it goes, of course, to the same syllable The examples given in the comment are this time well selected, and illustrate the three cases involved they are *shatt sam padyante* (v 4 3[4] et al) and *vashatt svâhâ* (vii 3 12), in both of them a *t* is inserted, by rule v 33, between the *t* and *s*, and the final reading and division is *tt-ths* and *tt-thsv* As counter-example we have *akshnayâ vyâghârayati* (v 2 7[5] et al), where, after all rules are satisfied, we have *kkhsht-tn*

As compared with those to which rule 7 applies, the consonant groups falling under this rule are few, only forty-six in all, in thirty of which the spirant carries the mute before it to the following vowel, while in the remaining sixteen both go together to the one that precedes The detail is as follows

Of double groups, composed of a single mute and spirant, there are seven for example, *k-khsh* (*ksh*)

Of groups containing three consonants, the largest class is that formed by the addition of a semivowel to the preceding for example, *k khshy* (*kshy*) it contains ten groups Then there are two like *ñ-khsh* (*ñksh*), three like *tt-khsh* (*tksh*), and the isolated *rk-khs* (*rks*)

Of groups of four consonants there are seven on this side, all but one (*rtt ths=rtts*) like those of three, but with an added semivowel, which does not (xxi 7) change the division

On the other side, where the spirant goes back to the vowel of the antecedent syllable, there are, of course, no groups of two consonants Of groups of three we have nine, four with following non-nasal mute (as *kkhst-t=kst*), and five with following nasal (as *kkhsht-tn=kshn*) Of groups of four, there are two (as *tthst-tr= tstr*) formed from the foregoing with added semivowel, and three from triplets ending in a sibilant increased by a mute, either non-nasal (namely *nthst-t=ntst*) or nasal (as *ñkhsht-tn=ñkshn*) The two groups of five consonants, which also belong here, have been given above, under rule 7

This finishes the subject of the division of consonant-groups in syllabication, the special elaborateness and intricacy of whose treat-

---

9 *pûrvaç cakâro nâsikyâ* (xxi 8) *ity anena samuccayavâcakah uttaras tu*[1] *parasvarângatvâkarshakah ûshmapara sparçaç ca parasvarângam bhavati asâv*[2] *ûshmâ*[3] *paraç cet*[4] *parasvarângam*[5] *ced ity arthah shat ... vashat.... ûshmaparaç ced iti kim aksh-.... ûshmâ paro yasmâd asâv ûshmaparah*

[1] G M *cakaro 'pi* [2] B *asâ* [3] MSS *-ma* [4] W *cen na*, O *cen sha* [5] W B *-gaç*, O *ga*

ment in this Prâtiçâkhya has rendered necessary a fuller illustration than was thought worth while in connection with the others, in order to render apprehensible the views held regarding it by the authors of the treatise

स्वरितात्सꣳहितायामनुदात्तानां प्रचय उदात्तश्रुतिः ॥ १० ॥

10 Of grave syllables following a circumflex in *samhitâ* there is *pracaya*, having the tone of acute

The theory of the *pracaya* accent has been so fully set forth in the note to Ath Pr iii 65 that I do not need to spend many words upon it here Its effect is, as there pointed out, to give to all the syllables which are left in the written text without any accent-mark the same high tone, whether they be *udâtta*, 'acute,' or *anudâtta*, 'grave' Thus, in the example given by the commentator, *ágne dudhra gahya kiñçila vanya yá' te* (v 5 9[1] G M omit *yâ te*), which is written in *pada*-text

अग्ने । दुध्र । गह्य । किꣳशिल । वन्य । या । ते ।,

the *samhitâ*-reading is

अग्ने दुध्र गह्य किꣳशिल वन्य या ते,

the grave syllables *dudhra gahya kiñçila van-* being without written designation of accent, like the two acute syllables *ág-* and *yá'*, and being by this rule uttered upon the same pitch with them It makes no difference whether the circumflex which precedes the *pracaya* is enclitic (as in the illustration given) or independent, and I have pointed out above (under xiv 3) that, owing to the absence of *kampa* in the Taittirîya-Sanhita where a circumflex precedes an acute, there are very numerous cases in the text where the *samhitâ* alone does not show us whether the unmarked syllables following a circumflex are *udâtta* or *pracaya*—whether, for example,

ह्येतद्देवाः, सो ऽस्मादेतर्हि, and सो ऽकामयत प्रजाः,

are to be read *hy ètád devâ'h* or *hy ètad devâ'h*, *sò 'smâ'd etárhi* or *sò 'smâd etárhi*, *sò 'kâ'mâyátá prajâ'h* or *sò 'kâmayata prajâ'h*

In the note referred to, I ventured the conjecture that the mode

10 *svaritât pareshâm anudâttânâm anudâttayor anudâttasya vâ samhitâyâm* [1] *pracayo nama dharmo*[2] *bhavati yathâ agne* .... *anudâttânâm iti kim agnaye* .... *samhitâyâm iti kim agne* .... *udâttasya çrutir iva çrutir yasyâ 'sâv*[3] *udâttaçrutir iti*[4] *pracayasvarûpam ûpanam*[5] *ato na punaruktiçankâ*[6].

[1] B ins *ca* [2] G M *dheyo* [3] G M *sa* for *asâu* [4] W om [5] B *svarûpanam* [6] W *-ktikâmvâ*

of writing the accent might not have been without influence on the theory as to its character—that is is to say, that the Vedic phonetists may have come by an afterthought to declare the *pracaya* syllables of acute tone, and to pronounce them so, *because* they agreed with the acute in being without a sign of accent, while originally no such correspondence in character was perceived or intended to be signified The conjecture will doubtless have appeared to many somewhat wild, but I think that in studying the development of the Hindu theory respecting accent it at any rate deserves to be taken fully into account and carefully considered I am far from regarding it at present as anything more than a conjecture, yet one or two matters have come to light since it was put forth which at least add to its plausibility Haug, namely, in a valuable and interesting communication from India to the Journal of the German Oriental Society (vol xvii, 1863, p 799 ff), shows that the modern Hindu reciters of the Veda give tonic distinction only to the syllables that have the accent-signs, the *svarita* and *anudâtta*, so that the *udâtta* appears to be no accent at all, and is entirely confounded with the toneless *pracaya*—thus, under the influence of the mode of written designation, turning topsy-turvy, as it were, the whole system of spoken accent And again, the peculiar system of writing the accent practised in the Çatapatha-Brâhmana (which uses only one sign, the horizontal stroke beneath the syllable, applied in all the other known systems to mark the *anudâtta* tone), has been turned in later times into a peculiar system of accenting, and treatises have been written to explain and teach it as such (see Kielhorn and Weber, in Weber's Indische Studien, x 397 ff *)

The commentator points out that two grave syllables, or even one, following the circumflex, receive the character of *pracaya* (of course, with the restriction made in the next rule), and not more than two only, as is literally signified by the plural *anudâttânâm* in the rule To show that the conversion into *pracaya* is limited to grave syllables, he quotes *agnáye právate* (ii 4 1[2] et al), to show that the conversion is made only in *samhitâ*, he gives part of the other passage in *pada*-form, namely *agne dudhra gahya kiñçila vanya* (O adds *yâ*) We might naturally infer from this that the *pracaya* accent does not occur at all in *pada*-text, but the inference is not a necessary one (since the rule only says that syllables which are *anudâtta* in their *pada*-form become *pracaya* in *samhitâ*, without implying that there may not be *pracayas* in *pada*-text which remain such in *samhitâ*), and would doubtless be erroneous, for at least the extant *pada*-text of the Taittirîya-Sanhitâ agrees in this respect with those of the other Vedas, and writes *gírvanase*, *antárikṣham*, and *samágachanta*, for example,

* It ought to be added, that Haug and Kielhorn do not look at the matter in the same light in which I have placed it, but incline to believe in the reality and antiquity of what I have called the modern and artificially substituted systems this is no place to discuss the subject, but I feel confident that the view I have taken will prove the only one tenable

गिर्वणासे । अंतरिक्षं । and सुमगंकृतेति संऽश्रगंकृत ।,
not गिर्वणासे । अंतरिक्षं ।----संऽश्रगंकृत

The peculiarity of this *pada*-text in treating the *avagraha* as a full *avasâna* in regard to the designation of accent (as shown in the third of the examples), has been already spoken of above (under rule xx 3)

The terms of the rule would justify us in understanding *pracaya* to have its etymological meaning of 'accumulation, continued series,' and translating 'a series of grave syllables following a circumflex in *samhitâ* is of acute tone,' and perhaps this was actually the intent of the rule-makers, but I have preferred, as the safer course, to follow the authority of the commentator in translating To him, indeed, the term is so distinctly a technical one, implying utterance with acute tone, that he thinks it necessary to explain that *udâttaçrutih* is added by way of definition of the peculiar character of the *pracaya*, and therefore is not open to the reproach of *punarukti*, or superfluous repetition

नोदात्तस्वरितपरः ॥ ११ ॥

11 But not when an acute or circumflex follows

That is to say, when such a series or *pracaya* of grave syllables is followed by an acute or a circumflex syllable, the one next preceding the latter is not made to be of acute tone, but retains its proper grave character, and is marked with the *anudâtta* sign The commentator offers as examples *táyâ devát'h sutám* (iv 1 2[1] W B omit *sutam*, without which the passage is found elsewhere, G M substitute *táyâ devátayâ*, iv 2 9[2] et al) and *tád âhuh kvà jágati* (vii 1 4[3] G M omit *jagatî*) These illustrations are wanting in variety, inasmuch as they show between the two independent accents only two original grave syllables, whereof one becomes an enclitic circumflex and the other remains grave, we may take the first example under the preceding rule as showing how an actual *pracaya* ends with a grave before the following original accent

The subject to be supplied with the predicate in this rule is *svarah*, of course There is an objectionable ambiguity in the form of the rule, inasmuch as there might most naturally seem to be *anuvṛtti* of *pracayah*, and so a denial of that accent anywhere excepting before a pause

We have seen at xix 2 that the name *vikrama* is given to the

---

11 *udâttaparah*[1] *svaritaparo vâ 'nudâttah pracayo na bhavati yathâ*[2] *tayâ.... tad..... udâttaç ca*[3] *svaritaç co 'dâttasvaritâu tâu parâu yasmât sa tatho 'ktah*

[1] O *ro vâ* [2] G M O om [3] B om

grave following a *pracaya*, as well as to one that comes immediately after a circumflex.

स्पर्शादनुत्तमादुत्तमपरादानुपूर्व्यान्नासिक्याः ॥ १२ ॥

12. After a non-nasal mute, when it is followed by a nasal, are inserted, in their order, nose sounds.

Which nose-sounds, as we are told in the next rule, some call *yamas*; and by this familiar name, which the other Prâtiçâkhyas apply to them directly, we shall here, as we have done elsewhere, know them. The treatise teaches us nothing more about them, except (ii. 49–51) that their place of production is either the nose or the mouth and nose, and that the producing organ is as in the series of mutes, and farther (xxi. 8), that in syllabication they are to be reckoned with the following vowel.

The theory of these curious and equivocal constituents of the ancient Hindu alphabet I have discussed pretty fully in the note to Ath. Pr. i. 99, and I have no new light to throw upon the subject here. They are transition-sounds, assumed to intervene between non-nasal and following nasal, as a kind of nasal counterpart to the non-nasal, and therefore called its *yama* or 'twin.'

The meaning of *ânupûrvyât*, 'in their order,' is ambiguous, as it might be understood to refer to the order either of the twenty non-nasal mutes or of the five nasals, or, of the four kinds of non-nasal mutes in each series—in which last sense the comment understands it, declaring that the first *yama* follows a first mute, the second a second, and so on, and he has before (under i. 1) reckoned the *yamas* as four in the catalogue of alphabetic sounds. I have pointed out under ii. 51 how difficult it is to reconcile this view with that of a variation of their organ of production as in the five series of mutes.

The commentator's examples are *tam pratnathâ* (i. 4. 9), *vimathnânâh* (iii. 5. 4³), *vidmâ te agne* (iv. 2. 2¹: O. omits *agne*), and *dârûni dadhmasi* (iv. 1. 10¹)—one, namely, for each of the four classes of mutes. As rule xiv. 24 expressly enjoins duplication of the non-nasal mute in these combinations, we are to read and divide *pratt-tnathâ*, *vidd-dma*, and so on. The counter-examples (of which all but the last are lost in W.) are as follows: to show that the insertion is made only after a mute, *kalmâshî bhavati* (v. 1. 1⁴: O. substitutes *brahmavâdinah*, i. 7. 1⁴ et al.), that this mute must be a

12. *uttamaparâd anuttamât sparçâd* ¹ *ânupûrvyâd yathâkramam nâsikyâ âgamâ bhavanti prathamasparçât prathamanâsikyah*² *dvitîyâd*³ *dvitîyah*⁴ *evam* ⁵*anyatrâ 'pi*⁵ *yathâ*⁶ *tam ---- vim---- vidmâ---- dâr---- ityâdi sparçâd iti kim* ⁷*kalm---- anuttamâd iti kim sumn---- uttamaparâd iti kim* ⁷ *sabdah----*

¹ G. M. ins. *parata*; O. ins. *parah*. ² G. M. O. *kyâh*. ³ O. *yasparçad*. ⁴ G. M. *-yâh*. ⁽⁵⁾ G. M. *anye*. ⁶ O. om. ⁽⁷⁾ W. om.

non-nasal, *sumnâya sumninî* (i 1 13³ et al O substitutes *sushumnah*, iii 4 7¹), and that it must be followed by a nasal, *sabdah sagarah sumekah* (iv 4 7² G M omit *sumekah*, O substitutes *vashatt svâhâ*, vii 3 12)

These examples are one-sided, in that they only exhibit the simplest form of group in which the *yama* is taken as increment Of such simplest groups there are twenty-three met with in the Sanhita namely, after first mutes, *kn*, *kn*, *km*, *cñ*, *cm*, *tn*, *tn*, *tm*, *pn*, *pn*, *pm*, after second mutes, *chm*, *thn*, after third mutes, *gn*, *gm*, *jñ*, *jm*, *dn*, *dm*, after fourth mutes, *ghn*, *dhn*, *dhm*, *bhn* Then, of groups of three consonants involving such combinations *jñy* (*jj-jñy*), *tny*, *ñchm*, *ñjñ* (*ñj-jñ*), *dghn* (*ddgh-ghn*), *nghn*, *rjm* (*rjj-jm*), *rtn*, *rtm*, *rdhn*, *rdhm*, *stm* (*sst-tm*), *sthn* And of groups of four consonants, *rjmy* (*rjj-jmy*)

According to the phonetic systems of the other Prâtiçâkhyas, this would finish the tale of *yamas* But, by the peculiar rule (xiv 9) which here requires a surd mute to be everywhere inserted between a sibilant and a following nasal, is brought forth a new and numerous brood of these curious twins Thus, in double groups, *çn* (*çt-tn*), *çm*, *shn*, *shm*, *sn*, *sm* Of groups of three containing these *çny*, *shnv*, *kshm* (*kkhshp-pm*), *kshn*, *tsn*, *tsm*, *psn*, *rçm* (*rççp-pm*), *rshn*, *rshm*, *ssm* Of groups of four, *ñkshn*, *hkshn*, *ççny* In all, of both classes, fifty-seven groups

तान्यमानेके ॥ १३ ॥

13 Some call these *yamas*

The commentator adds nothing of value

हकारान्नणमपरान्नासिक्यम् ॥ १४ ॥

14 After *h*, when followed by *n*, *n*, or *m*, is inserted *nâsikya*

I have translated this rule according to its obvious and incontrovertible meaning, which, if it needed any external support, would find it in the almost precisely accordant rule of the Ath Pr (i 100 the teachings of the other treatises upon the subject are much less distinct see the note on the Atharvan rule) But the commentator gives it an entirely different interpretation The ablative *hakârân*, he says, is here used in the sense of an accusative (his addition, "in the absence of *lyap* [the suffix *ya*]," I do

13 *tân nâsikyân eke çâkhino yamân bruvate*¹. *uktâny evo 'dâharanâni*

¹ G M *iti vadanti*

14 *hakârâd iti karmani*¹ *lyablope*² *pañcamî. tasmân nanamaparam hakâram âruhya nâsikyam bhavati*³ *sânunâsiko hakârah syâd ity arthah. ahnâm---- apar----- brahm----*

¹ W *ma* ² W *lyapulope*, B *lyaplope*, O *lyaçlope* ³ B *ved iti*

not understand), and the sense is, that a nose sound is imposed upon the *h* itself, or that the latter becomes nasal. It is not difficult to see on what this theory of the quality of a *h* preceding a nasal is founded—namely, a recognition of the fact that such a *h* is really an expiration of breath through the nose: it being not less true of *h* before a semivowel or nasal than before a vowel, that it is (borrowing the phraseology of an earlier rule, ii 47) *udaya-varnâdisasthâna*, 'produced in the position of the succeeding letter.' The commentator's exposition might have come from the "some authorities" to whom the doctrine of that rule is attributed.

The examples given are *ahnâm ketuh* (ii 4 14[1]), *aparâhne* (ii 1 2[5]), and *brahmavâdinah* (i 7 1[4] et al.). Giving to the rule its real meaning, and applying the principle laid down at xxi 8 for the syllabic division, we should read *ahh-ⁿnâm*, and so with the rest. As was suggested under Ath Pr i 100, it is probably this separation of the *h* from the nasal in syllabication that has led to the division of the two in point of utterance, and then to the thrusting in between them of a transition-sound.

G M have adapted the reading of the rule to the new interpretation, and give *hakâraṅ naṇamaparaṅ nâsikyam* (the writing of *ṅ* instead of *m* before *n* is frequent with these MSS).

रेफोष्मसंयोगे रेफस्वरभक्तिः ॥ १५ ॥

15. In the combination of *r* and a spirant, there is a *svarabhakti* of *r*.

The doctrine of our Prâtiçâkhya respecting the *svarabhakti* is less detailed, and less distinctly expressed, than that of the other treatises (for which, see the note to Ath Prât i 101–2); from the statement here made, we should not even understand that this "vowel-fragment" is to be an insertion between the *r* and the spirant, although that is doubtless intended to be signified. The commentator enters into a long exposition of the subject, by no means, however, limiting himself to explaining and illustrating his text. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G M) are in some parts of this exposition fuller than the rest, and will be followed

---

15 [1]*rephasya co "shmanaç ca samyoge sati*[1] *rephasvarabhaktir iti jânîyât* [2]*svarasya bhaktih svarabhaktih*[2] *yo 'sya rephasya samânasvaras*[3] *tadbhaktih syât rkâraç câ 'sya jihvâgrakaranatvena*[4] *raçrutyâ*[5] *ca*[6] *samânadharmah* [7]*bhaktir avayava ekadeça iti yâvat*[7] *etad uktam bhavati rkârâvayavo*[8] *bhavatî 'ty arthah sûtrenâ 'nena svarabhaktir eva*[9] *vihitâ svarabhaktisvarûpam tu*[10] *vispashtam*[11] *vyacashte vararucih* [12]*rkârâdir anumâtrâ*[13] *repho 'rdhamâtrâ madhye çeshâ*[14] *svarabhaktir iti*[15] *asyâ 'yam arthah*[12]

indriyavishayo[16] *yo*[17] *'sâv anur ity ucyate budhaih*
caturbhir[18] *anubhir mâtrâparimânam*[19] *iti smrtam* [20]

in the abstract of it here given the version of W B O, indeed, has rather the aspect of being an abbreviation of the other, and one not everywhere skilfully made

At the outset, G M alone specify that the *svarabhakti* is combined with the spirant (and yet, by xxi 6, it is to be separated from the spirant in syllabication, going with the *r* to the preceding vowel) The term *svarabhakti* means 'a fragment, piece, or part of a vowel,' and a *rephasvarabhakti*, '*r*-vowel-fragment,' means a bit of the vowel that is akin, or has the same mode of utterance with, the *r* Now the *ṛ* is of like quality with *r*, in being produced with the tip of the tongue and in having the sound of *r* and it is a part of *ṛ* that is intended The rule merely prescribes the insertion, the nature of the latter is clearly set forth by Vararuci (one of the three principal sources of the present comment see note to the introductory verses, pp 6,7) The vowels are defined at i 5, and since among them only *ṛ* agrees in place and organ with *r*, the "fragment" is of *ṛ* The *ṛ* is by i 31 declared to be short, or of one *mora*, and Vararuci defines the short *ṛ* as composed of a quarter-*mora* of vowel at the beginning, a half-*mora* of *r* in the middle, and a quarter-*mora* of vowel (W B O say, of vowel-fragment) at the end Then a verse is quoted describing the word *anu* as signifying a quarter-*mora* This half-*mora* of *r*, now, found in the middle of *ṛ*, being divided, its two parts, each combined with the quarter-*mora* of vowel, severally receive the name of *svarabhakti* Hence there are two *svarabhakti*'s And in answer to the question where this *svarabhakti* of half a *mora* occurs, the makers of the Çiksha have declared that the one ending with the vowel element occurs before *ç*, *sh*, and *s*, and the one ending with the consonant element before *h*, the former, moreover, being open, and the latter close And it is added that in *yo vâi çraddhâm* (i 6 8[1]) there is no *svarabhakti*, on account of absence of the order prescribed in the rule

---

mâtrikasya ṛkârasyâ "dir anumâtrâ[21] *svarabhâgo madhye repho 'rdhamâtrâ*[22] *çesho*[23] *'py anumâtrâ*[24] *svarabhâgah etad ṛkârasvarûpam atra*[25] *rephe 'rdhamâtre bhajyamâne*[26] *sati*[27] *tâu bhâgâu pûrvottarâv*[28] *anusahitâu*[29] *pratyekam svarabhaktinâmadheyam bhajete*[30] [31]*sâ ca svarabhaktir ardhamâtrâ. kutra*[32] *vâ*[33] *svarabhaktir*[31] *ity âçañkya çikshâkârâir*[34] *uktam*

çashaseshu svarodayam[35] *hakâre vyañjanodayâm*[36]
çashaseshu tu[37] *vivrtâm*[38] *hakâre samvrtâm*[39] *vidur* *iti*[40]

yo . . . . ityâdâu [41]*sûtroktakramâbhâvân na svarabhaktih*[41]
svarabhaktyantaram[42] *çikshâyâm uktam*
[43]*karenuh karvinî câi 'va harinî hârite*[44] *'ti ca*
hansapade[45] *'ti vijñeyâh pañcâi 'tâh svarabhaktayah.*[43]
[46] *karenû*[47] *rahayor*[48] *yoge*[49] *karvinî lahakârayoh*
harinî [50]*raçasânâm ca*[50] *hârità*[51] *laçakârayoh*

So much by way of (would-be) explanation of the rule But the commentator goes on to say that the Çikshâ teaches other *svarabhakti*'s, to the number of five namely, the *karenu*, between *r* and *h*, as in *barhih* (i 1 2[1] et al), the *karvinî*, between *l* and *h*, as in *malhâh* (ii 1 2[4]), the *harinî*, between *r* and *ç* or *s*, as in *darçapûrnamâsâu* (ii 2 5[4] et al) and *barsam* (ii 5 7[1]), the *hârita* (or *harita*), between *l* and *ç*, as in *sahasravalçâh* (vi 3 3[3]), and the *hansapadâ* (or *hansapâdâ*), between *r* and *sh*, as in *varshâhvâm* (ii 4 10[3])—and he who wants to go to heaven (on the score, no doubt, of patience, faith, and punctiliousness) must utter the five kinds of *bhakti*, as thus laid down It appears, then, that the commentator's Çikshâ, like the Vâj Pr (iv 16), regards *l*, not less than *r*, as followed by *svarabhakti* before a spirant

न क्रमे प्रथमपरे प्रथमपरे ॥१६॥

16 But not in case of *krama*, when a first mute follows the spirant

The commentator defines *krama* as the equivalent of *dvitva*, 'duplication,' and refers as authority to rule xxiv 5, where the word occurs again without, according to him, admitting any other meaning, whence, he infers, it must signify the same thing here also We should rather turn the argument the other way, and say that, as *krama* can have no other meaning here, it may be conjectured to signify the same thing at xxiv 5 He further coolly

---

[52]*yâ tu hansapadâ nâma sâ tu*[52] *rephashakârayoh*
[53]*evam pañcavidhâm bhaktim uccaret svargakâmukah* [53]

(1) G M *rephoshmanos sayyoge sati tatra ushmasayyukto* (2) G M *svarabhaktir iti kim idrçi svarasya bhakti s svarabhaktih bhaktir bhagah avayava iti ekadeça iti yâvat*, B O om *svarabhaktih* [3] G M O *nakaranasv-* [4] O *nena* [5] G M *çrutyâ* [6] W *yana* (7) G M om , O *-ça ity arthah* [8] W O *rkara eva yi* , G M *rkârasya 'nay-* [9] G M *evam* [10] B om [11] O *spa-* (12) G M *svaras tavat kimviçishta iti cet shodaçâ 'ditah svarah* (i 5) *iti svarasan jnoktam teshu rkararephayos samânasthânakaranatvad rkarasvarasyai 'va bhaktih rkaras tavat kim viçishta iti cet rkaralkârâu hrasvau* (i 31) *iti hrasvatvad ekamatro bhaved dhrasva iti ekamatraka rkârah vararucinai 'vam uktam matrikasya rkarasya 'dau svarasya 'numâtrah rephasya 'rdhamatro madhye 'nta svarasya 'numatra iti anumâtra iti kim* [13] B *-tratam api* [14] O *resha* [15] B om , O *anumatrâ* [16] W *nish* , G M *-driyâv-* [17] B O om [18] W O *tur* [19] W *matruprayanam*, B *-trâpramânam*, G M *-na* [20] G M ins *asyâ 'yam arthah* [21] B G M *tra* [22] G M *-trah* [23] G M *ante* [24] W *trah*, G M *tra* [25] G M ins *rkarama dhyavartini* [26] G M *vibh* [27] O om [28] G M *ra* [29] W B O *samh* [30] W B *bhajyate* G M O *bhajate* (31) G M *tato dve svarabhakti vidyete ardhamatrikasvarabhaktih kutra vâ tishthati* [32] W *atra* [33] W om , B *ka* [34] G M ins *evam* [35] W B *yâ* [36] W B *-yâ* [37] B O *ca* [38] W *ta* [39] W *ta* [40] O om (41) G M *sûtreno 'ktakramena syât svarabhaktih* [42] G M O ins *api* (43) O om [44] G M *har-* [45] G M *pâde* [46] G M ins *karya eta iti cet* [47] W B *nu*, G M *-num* [48] B *hayor*, G M *harayor* [49] W B G M *vidyat* (50) W B *raçayor yoge*, G *çasvarâni jñeyâ*, M *çasâm jñeya* [51] G M *har-* (52) G M *svarabhaktim hansapâdâm vidyâd* (53) O om , G M *muka iti yatha karenuh barhih yathâ karvini malhâh harini darçapurnamasai rita sahasravalçâh hansapâda varshahvam ityadi*

inserts an "or" in the rule, and declares it to mean 'either when the spirant is doubled or when it is followed by a first mute' This must evidently be condemned for, in the first place, the text contains no "or," and, in the second place, if that were the meaning, the specification would be superfluous, since the spirant is always doubled before a first mute, and so *krame* would include all the cases—except, indeed, according to the doctrine of Plakshi and Plakshayana, who (xiv 17) deny the duplication of the spirant in such a situation, and we are perhaps to connect his interpretation of the present rule with his apparent acceptance of the doctrine referred to, and suppose that he would read *rsh-t*, and *rçp-p̄m* etc (namely, for *rçm*, *rshn*, and *rshm*), while the reading actually approved by the treatise is *rshsh t*, *rççp-p̄m* etc There are five groups—namely *rçy*, *rçv*, *rshy*, *rsv*, and *rhy*—in which the difference of interpretation would make a difference as regards the presence or absence of *svarabhakti*, if the "or" is implied, they will be read and divided *rç çy* etc, if not, they will be *r^r ç çy* etc

The commentator's examples are *dârçyam yajñam* (iii 2 2[3] only O has *yajñam*, G M read *dârçyam hi*, which, if it be an actual passage, I have overlooked in searching out the references), *varshyâbhyah* (vii 4 13 W B O read *varshâbhyah*), *barsvebhih* (v 7 11), and *etarhy ârûdhah* (v. 1 5[5] found in O only), illustrating four of the five cases in which his interpretation would exclude the *svarabhakti*, and further, for cases in which a first mute follows, *adarçma jyotih* (iii 2 5[4] omitted in O), *kârshnî upânahâu* (v 4 4[4] et al), and *varshtâ parjanyah* (vii 5 20 found in G M only)

CHAPTER XXII

CONTENTS 1–2, formation of articulate sounds in general, 3–8, definition of terms used in the treatise, 9–10, mode of production of high and low tone, 11–12, established tone and pitch, 13, length of pauses in the text, 14–15, heavy and light syllables

---

16. [1]*kramaçabdo dvitvaparyâyah katham etat prakrtir vikramah krama* (xxiv 5) *ity atra dvitvasyâi*[2] *'va*[1] *kramaçabdenâ*[3] *'bhidhânâd atrâ 'pi sa evâ*[4] [5]*'rtha iti niçcinumah*[5] *ûshmanah krame sati*[6] *tasminn ûshmani prathamapare vâ*[7] *sati na svarabhaktir bhavati*[8] [9]*krame yathâ*[9] *dârç-.... varsh-.... bars ..* [10]*prathamapare yathâ ad-....*[10] *kâr ....* [11] *prathamah paro yasmâd asâu prathamaparah*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane ekavinço[12] *'dhyâyah*

(1) O om [2] G M *tvam asty e* [3] W *bdo nâmâ* [4] W *rvâ* (5) G M *'rtho niçcitah* [6] O om, G M add *va.* [7] G M put after *sati* [8] W *vet* (9) O om. (10) O. *et ar-/..*, G M *etasya prathamaparo y-* [11] G M add *varshtâ...* [12] G M O *dvitiyavaraine navâmo*

शब्दः प्रकृतिः सर्ववर्णानाम् ॥ १ ॥

1 Tone is the material of all articulate sounds

The putting-together, as well as the material, of this and the following chapter is rather peculiar, and makes the impression of a supplement to the Prâtiçâkhya proper This present rule and its successor are akin with the first two of the next chapter, and all these with the rules of the second chapter As under ii 1, the commentator explains *çabda* by *dhvani*, for *prakṛti* he gives as synonym *mûlakâranam*, 'radical cause,' and *varna* he declares to designate the whole congeries of vowels and consonants

तस्य रूपान्यत्वे वर्णान्यत्वम् ॥ २ ॥

2 In the difference of form of the former consists the difference of the latter

That is to say, in the difference resulting from the variety of positions giving audible quality compare ii 3

तत्र शब्दद्रव्याण्युदाहरिष्यामः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Here we will instance the offices of terms

A complete and violent change of subject is introduced by this rule, continuing to rule 9, which last, again, attaches itself closely enough to the beginning of the chapter to have been its natural continuation The intervening batch of rules looks like an interpolation, thrust in at this point *apropos* of *çabda* in rule 1, the word being taken here, however, in an entirely different sense The commentator tries to smooth over the transition by pronouncing *çabda* a synonym of *çâstra*, 'text-book, body of doctrine,' which latter is formed by the putting to use of combinations of the alphabetic sounds just above spoken of He distinctly ascribes to *dravya* the sense of 'office, aim,' as the connection also requires,

---

1 *sarvavarnânâm*[1] *çabdo* [2] *dhvanih prakṛtir mûlakâranam bhavati varnaçabdena svaravyañjanâtmako râçir ucyate sarve ca te varnâç ca sarvavarnâh*[3] *teshâm*[4]

[1] G M om [2] G M ins *nâma* [3] O om [4] G M add *sarvavarnanâm*

2 *prâtiçrutkasthânabhedât*[1] *tasya* [2] *prakṛtibhûtasya*[3] *rûpânyatve sati varnânyatvam syât*[4] *yathâ a i u ityâdi*

[1] B *prat-*, G M *nâd bhe* [2] G M ins *çabdasya* [3] W *pratibh* [4] O om

3 *teshâm varnânâm sarvatra*[1] *samghâtaprayoge* [2] *çâstram*[3] *ity*[4] *ucyate* [5] *tasya çabda*[6] *iti paryâyanâma tatra tasmiñ châstre yâni dravyâni bhavanti tâny udâharishyâmah yat karma yena kriyate*[8] *tat*[9] *tasya dravyam*[10] *sâdhanam iti yâvat*[11] *yathâ gha-*

giving *sâdhana*, 'efficiency,' as its equivalent As clay to a vessel, we are told, so are alphabetic sounds to a text-book

वर्णकारौ निर्देशकौ ॥ ४ ॥

4 *Varna* and *kâra* are indicatory

These two terms have already formed the subject of rules i 16–20 Rules vi 1,7 are cited as examples of their use

चापीत्यन्वादेशकौ ॥ ५ ॥

5 *Ca* and *api* are implicative

Rules vi 3 and iv 4 are cited as containing examples of the use of these signs of continued implication from something that has gone before

त्वथैवेति विनिवर्तकाधिकारकावधारकाः ॥ ६ ॥

6 *Tu*, *atha*, and *eva* are exceptional, introductory, and restrictive, respectively

The use of these connectives is instanced by quoting rules i 19, v 1, and xiv 3 (G M substitute vii 1 for the second)

These rules are too trivial and superficial to make it worth while to enter, in connection with them, into any discussion of the use of the particles in the text of the Prâtiçâkhya The index, and the notes on each rule, will give the means of investigating the matter We have often had occasion to animadvert upon the commentator's

---

tasya mrd ity evam çâstrasya varnâh[12] *yâni dravyâni samvyavahârârthâni kartavyâni tâni vyâkhyâsyâmah çabdasya dravyâni çabdadravyâni tâni*

[1] O *-ta* [2] O ins *vâ* [3] W *-tre* [4] W B *katham*, O om [5] W B ins *tasya rûpâni* [6] W O *-bda* [7] O *pradarçayishy-* [(8)] O *karmayate* [9] W *tatra*, B *na* [10] B *-ya*, M om [11] O om [12] W *-na*, G M *-nânâm*, O *savarnah*

4 *varnaçabdah kâraçabdaç ca nirdeçakâu*[1] *nirdeçavâcakâu*[2] *syâtâm yathâ. avarnavyañjanaçakuni* (vi 7) *iti* · *atha shakâraň sakâravisarjanîyâv* (vi 1) *iti varnaç ca kâraç ca varnakârâu*

[1] G M om [2] W B *deçakâu vâc*, O om

5 *ca api ity etâv*[1] *anvâdeçakâu syâtâm pûrvâpekshayâ*[2] *'nvâdeça ity ucyate. yathâ asadâmâsiñcaňç ca* (vi 3). *itiparo 'pi* (iv 4)

[1] G M ins *çabdâu* [2] W B *pûrvapaksho*, O *pûrvo paksho*

6 *tu. atha eva ity ete çabdâ yathâkramena*[1] *vinivartakâdhikârakâvadhârakâ bhavanti yatra tuçabdah çrûyate tatra*

tendency to put into them (especially into *tu*) a meaning which they were never intended to bear

वेति वैभाषिकः ॥ ७ ॥

7 *Vâ* is alternative

Rule ii 50 is quoted as example

नेति प्रतिषेधकः ॥ ८ ॥

8 *Na* is prohibitive

The example this time is xiii 15 (G M substituting xiv 14), and in it appear again some of the differences of reading which were noted in the rule itself where it occurred

आयामो दारुण्यमणुता खस्येत्युच्चैःकराणि शब्दस्य ॥ ९ ॥

9 Tension, hardness smallness of aperture, are producers of high tone

Reference is made to rule i 38, in which the acute accent is defined as consisting in high tone, and the present precept is declared to be given for the sake of that, and in order to prohibit that slack or indifferent utterance which prevails in common life *Âyâma*, 'tension,' is explained as meaning rather 'extension (literally 'longness') of the members,' *dârunya*, as 'severity of the vowel,' and *anutâ khasya*, as 'closure of the orifice of the throat' this is what one who would utter a sound in high tone must do

There is evidently much more guess-work than true observation in this rule and the one next following if they had been given as definitions of sonant and surd utterance, instead of high and low

---

nivrttih yatrâ 'thaçabdas tatrâ 'dhikârah yatrâi 'vaçabdas tatrâ 'vadhâranam [2] *veditavyam yathâ ephas tu rasya* (i 19) [3]*atha sañhitâyâm ekaprânabhâve*[4] (v 1) [3] *sparça*[5] *evâi 'keshâm âcâryânâm* (xiv 3) *viçeshena nivartayatî 'ti vinivartakah adhikarotî 'ty adhikârakah*[6] *avadhârayatî 'ty avadhârakah*

[1] G M *mam* [2] G M O ins *ce 'ti* [3] G M *atha nakâro nakâram* (vii 1) [4] O om [5] G M *-çapara* [6] W O G M *-rah*

7 *ve 'ty esha çabdo vâibhâshiko*[1] *vâikalpiko bhavati yathâ mukhanâsikyâ vâ* (ii 50)

[1] G M *shako* (as also in the rule)

8. *ne 'ty esha çabdah pratishedhako bhavati*[1] *yathâ* [2]*na shumnognir* (xiii 15) *iti* [2]

[1] G M O *syât* [2] G M *atha na* (xiv 14), B *na sushu*, O *na sum-*, W B *-gni 'ti*

tone, they might more easily have been regarded as describing real processes of articulation

अन्ववसर्गो मार्दवमुरुता खस्येति नीचैःकराणि ॥ १० ॥

10 Relaxation, softness, wideness of aperture, are producers of low tone

The exposition of this rule runs quite parallel with that of the preceding (only O, however, referring to the definition of *anudâtta*, 'grave,' as of low tone, at i 39) To *anvavasarga* is given *vinatatâ*, 'drooping condition,' as synonym, to *mârdava*, *snigdhatâ*, 'smoothness,' and to *urutâ*, *sthûlatâ*, 'bigness' There is nothing at all to commend in such a description of the way in which low tone is produced

मन्द्रमध्यमताराणि स्थानानि भवन्ति ॥ ११ ॥

11 Soft, middle, and loud are the three qualities

Their use, we are told, will be explained farther on—namely, in rules 4–10 of the next chapter I have ventured to render *sthâna*, literally 'place' or 'position,' by 'quality,' as better expressing the nature of the distinctions implied The name apparently comes from such theories as that laid down in rule xxiii 10 as to the "place" of production of the different qualities of tone

In answer, we are told, to the suggested inquiry, "of what are

---

9 *uccâir udâtta* (i 38) *ity uktam tadartham idam ârabhyate lokavad yâdrchikoccâranapratishedhârtham*[1] *âyâmo gâtrânâm dâirghyam dârunyam svarasya kathinatâ* [2]*anutâ khasya galavivarasya*[3] *samvrtatâ* [2] *etâni sâdhanâni*[4] *çabdasyo 'ccâihkarâni*[5] [6]*çabdam uccâir udâttam kurvantî 'ty arthah uccaçabdam uccârayatâi 'tat kartavyam iti vidhih*[6] *'uccâih kurvantî 'ty uccâihkarâni*[7]

[1] W *yavach-*, B *hadach*, W B O *rthah* [(2)] W om [3] B *vivaranasya*, G M *-vivalasya*, and put after *samvrtata* (B O *vrtâ*) [4] G M *namadheyani* [5] W *ccâk* [(6)] G M om [(7)] W G M om, B adds *kapanini*, and om the following rule

10 [1] *anvavasargo gâtrânâm vinatatâ*[2] *mârdavam svarasya snigdhatâ khasyo 'rutâ kanthasya sthûlate 'ty*[3] *etâni sâdhanâni çabdasya nîcâihkarâni çabdam nîcam anudâttam*[4] *kurvantî 'ty arthah nîcaçabdam uccârayatâi*[5] *'tat kartavyam iti vidhih nîcâih kurvantî 'ti nîcâihkarâni*

[(1)] O ins *nîcâir anudatta* (i 39) *ity uktam* [2] G M O *vistrtatâ* [3] G M om *iti* [4] G M *ud* [5] W *uddhârayanâ*, B *-yan*, G M *-ranîyatâ* O *ranatâ*

11 [1]*mandram madhyamam târam ce 'ti*[2] *sthânâni bhavanti.*[1] *mandram iti prathamam madhyamam iti dvitîyam târam iti*

these positions or qualities?" the subject is continued in the next rule

तत्रैकविंशतिर्यमाः ॥ १२ ॥

12 'In them are twenty one tones

For the application of these tones or keys, also, we are referred to a later passage (xxiii 11 etc) As synonym of *yama* is given *svara*, 'tone'

The commentator chooses to connect these rules with those that follow in the next chapter, and to overlook the obvious fact that in the two chapters we have separate and independent statements upon the same subject, which cannot have come from the same hand, and of which the second renders the first wholly superfluous

ऋग्विरामः पदविरामो विवृत्तिविरामः समानपदविवृत्तिविरामस्त्रिमात्रो द्विमात्र एकमात्रो ऽर्धमात्र इत्यानुपूर्व्येण ॥ १३ ॥

13 The verse pause, *pada* pause, pause for hiatus, and pause for hiatus in the interior of a word, are respectively of three *moras*, two *moras*, one *mora*, and a half *mora*

As example of the pause of three *moras* at the end of a verse is quoted *ubhâ vâjasya sâtaye huve vâm* (i 5 5² O omits the first two words), of the pause of two *moras*, in *pada*-text, between the *padas*, *ishe tvâ ûrje tvâ* (i 1 1 et al) and, for all that the Prâtiçâkhya tells us, we are to regard the *avagraha* pause, dividing the two parts of a compound word, as of the same length (the Rik [i 6, r 29] and Vâjasaneyi [v 1] Prâtiçâkhyas give it only one *mora*), of the hiatus pause, *sa idhânah* (iv 4 4⁵), *ta enam* (ii 3 11⁴), and *tâ asmât* (ii 4 4¹ W prefixes *â*, but doubtless only by

---

trtîyam eteshâm[3] *sthânânâm prayojanam uttaratra*[4] *vakshyate* [5]*etâni sthânâni keshâm ityapekshâyâm âha parasûtram*[6]

(1) G M om 2 O *'ty etani* 3 G M O *esh-* 4 B *ituratra* (5) O om

12 *teshu*[1] *sthâneshv ekavinçatir yamâh svarâ bhavanti teshâm yamânâm uttaratra prayojanam vakshyate*

1 O *tatra trishu*, B adds *trishu*

13 *rgvirâmâdayas trimâtrâdikâlâ*[1] *yathâkramam*[2] *bhavanti yathâ*[3] *ubhâ---- ity rgvirâmah ishe---- iti padavirâmah sa---- ta---- tâ---- iti vivrttivirâmah praugam iti samânapadavivrttivirâmah* [4]*rci*[5] *virâma rgvirâmah padasya virâmah padavirâmah padadvayavivrttâu*[6] *virâmo vivrttivirâmah*[7,4] *çikshâyâm* [8] *asya viçesha uktah*

a copyist's blunder), of the pause of interior hiatus, *praüigam* (iv 4 2[1]), which is, I believe, the only case The commentator also quotes a couple of verses from his Çiksha, laying down four subdivisions of the pause of hiatus, and assigning them different quantities that between a short and long vowel is *vatsânusrti*, and is one *mora* long, that between a long and following short is *vatsânusârinî*, of the same length, between two short vowels, *pâkavatî*, three quarters of a *mora*, between two long vowels, *pipîlikâ*, a quarter-*mora* only (Uvata's comment on the Rik Prat [ii 1] states the intervals quite differently) In W there are two verses which are not found in the rest, as they stand, their meaning is in great part obscure to me, and I prefer to leave them unamended and untranslated

यद्यञ्जनान्तं यदु चापि दीर्घं
संयोगपूर्वं च तथानुनासिकम् ॥
एतानि सर्वाणि गुरूणि विद्यात्
शेषाण्यतो ऽन्यानि ततो लघूनि ॥ १४ ॥

14 A syllable that ends with a consonant, one that has a long vowel, one that precedes a conjunction of consonants, one that is nasal—all these are to be accounted heavy, the rest, other than these, are light

---

[9]*pipîlikâ dîrghasame ca madhye*
savarnatâ pâkavatî padâikye
drshtvâ ca vatsânusrjas tv asâmye
tv atho 'ci mukhyas tu vivâmukâlah]
svarodaye tv anusvâro bhaved adhyamamâtrikah
virâmaç ca tayor madhye vâiçeshikâc ca dîrghayoh 2 [9]
hrasvâdir vatsânusrtir[10] *ante vatsânusârinî*
pâkavaty ubhayahrasvâ[11] *dîrghobhayâ*[12] *pipilikâ*
[13]*mâtrâ*[14] *ca*[15] *vatsânusrtis*[16] *tathâ vatsânusârinî*
pâdonâ syât pâkavatî pâdamâtrâ pipîlikâ [13]

[17]*samânam ca tat padam ca samânapadam ekapadam ity arthah*[17] [18] *samânapade vivrttih samânapadavivrttih tasyâm*[19] *virâmah*[20] *samânapadavivrttivirâmah* [21] *tisro mâtrâ yasyâ 'sâu trimâtrah* [22]*dve mâtre yasyâ 'sâu dvimâtrah ekâ mâtrâ yasyâ 'sâv ekamâtrah ardhâ mâtrâ yasyâ 'sâv ardhamâtrah*[22]

[1] W *-trak* [2] O *mena* [3] G M om [(4)] O puts below, at [18] [5] W *rg*, G M *rco* [6] B *padavi*, O *yamadhye vivrti* [7] W B om, O *padanv*. [8] G M ins *apy* [(9)] in W only [10] W *tsânugasrtimadhyer*, G M *nusâtir* [11] B *-yoh-*, G M *yeh-* [12] G M *-ghayos tu* [(13)] O om [14] G M *trikâ* [15] G M om [16] W *-nusrjanti*, G M *-nukrtis* [(17)] O puts below, at [21] [18] O puts [(4)] here [19] W om, B *smâ*, O *sya* [20] W om [21] O puts [(17)] here [(22)] in G, M only

The commentator instances the different kinds of "heavy" syllable, as follows: one ending with a consonant, *mâte 'va putram* (iv 2 3[2] et al.: G M omit), one long by its vowel, *te te 'dhipatayah* (iv 4 11[3]: G M omit the last word), one followed by a consonant-group, *açmâ ca me* (iv 7 5[1]: W has *ânmâyinâ*, which appears to be merely a corrupt reading, I have found nothing at all like it in the Sanhitâ), one that is nasal, *vinçatyâi* (vii 2 13 et al.)

The distinction of the syllable as "heavy" or "light" has value only in a metrical point of view, and does not make its appearance elsewhere in our treatise (except as it is referred to in rule xxiv 5—which rule we might have expected the commentator to quote here, as the occasion of this one). The quality of "long" or "short" belongs to the vowel alone, and (see xxi 1 and its comment) the consonants accompanying the latter are regarded as absorbed into it, and forming part of its natural quantity. This separation of "heavy" and "long," or of weight and quantity, is practically convenient, perhaps, but theoretically indefensible, and we have reason to be surprised that phonetic observers so acute as the Hindus had not worked the theory of syllabic quantity into a more consistent shape. The other treatises agree with this: see Ath. Pr. i 51–54, and notes.

The use of the word *anunâsika* in describing a syllable containing *anusvâra* is (as already noted, under ii 30) one more sign of a theory which regards the *anusvâra* as a quality and not an element. The Ath. Prât., which holds this theory, uses the same term in its definition (i 53). It deserves to be noted, however, that to read *anusvâram* instead of *anunâsikam* in the verse would help the metre, making the four *pâdas* similar.

This rule is enough by itself to determine the weight of any syllable whatever: but, as the commentator points out, the one following is added to resolve any doubts which might after all arise as to what syllables were light.

---

14. *vyañjanântam yad aksharam* [1]*vyañjanam ante*[2] *yasya tad vyañjanântam* [1] *yad u câ 'pi dîrgham* [3] *aksharam* [4] *samyoga-pûrvam ca yad aksharam* [5]*samyogât pûrvam*[5] *samyogapûrvam*[6] *tathâ 'nunâsikam sânunâsikam*[7] *yad aksharam uktâny etâni sarvâny aksharâni gurûni vidyât jânîyât yathâ* [8]*vyañjanântam mâte....* [8] *yathâ dîrgham te....* *yathâ*[9] *sâmyogapûrvam açmâ ...* *yathâ 'nunâsikam*[10] *vinçatyâi* [11] *çeshâny ato 'nyâni* [12] *uta*[13] *ebhyo gurubhyah çeshâny anyâny aksharâni* [14]*tato 'nantaram*[14] *laghûni vijânîyât*[15] *çeshâni*[16] *kânî 'ty âçañkyo 'ttaraçlokena*[17] *vivrnoti*

(1) G M put at beginning. [2] G M *tam*. [3] G M ins. *yad*. [4] G M ins. *yogât purvam*. (5) G M om. [6] B G M om.; O *gam*. [7] O om.; G M *anu*. (8) G M *vyañjanânâm ity atra*. [9] G M om. [10] O puts before *yatha*. [11] B omits from here to the middle of rule 15 (beginning again with *samyogaparam*). [12] G M O ins. *tato laghûni*. [13] W *eta*. (14) G M om. [15] G M *jân-*. [16] W *-ni 'ti*. [17] W *-ke*.

अव्यञ्जनान्तं यद्ध्रस्वमसंयोगपरं च यत् ।
अननुस्वारसंयुक्तमेतल्लघु निबोधतै
तल्लघु निबोधत ॥ १५ ॥

15 A syllable that does not end with a consonant, that has a short vowel, and that is not followed by a conjunction of consonants, and one that is not combined with *anusvâra*—know that to be light

This is a mere negative to the preceding rule, and a wholly superfluous addition to it—and an addition made, we may conjecture, by a different and later hand the use of the term *anusvâra* distinctly suggests this

The commentator quotes, by way of example of light syllables, simply *madudayanâ asan* (vi 1 5[1] B O omit the last word)

CHAPTER XXIII

CONTENTS 1–3, causes of the differences of articulated sounds, 4–10, qualities or temperaments of voice, 11–19, tone or pitch of utterance, 20, general mode of correct utterance

अथ वर्णविशेषोत्पत्तिः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the origin of the differences of articulate sounds.

---

15 [1]*avyañjanântam yad aksharam yac ca hrasvam yac* [2]*câ 'samyogaparam*[2] *yac câ 'nanusvârasamyuktam etat sarvam aksharam laghu*[3] *nibodhata*[4] *jânîdhvam yathâ*[4] *mad-.... ityâdi vyañjanam ante*[5] *yasya tad vyañjanântam* [6]*na vyañjanântam avyañjanântam* [6] *samyogah paro yasmât tat samyogaparam* [7]*na samyogaparam*[7] *asamyogaparam* [8]*anusvârena samyuktam*[8] *anusvârasamyuktam* [9]*nâ 'nusvâra asamyuktam*[9] *ananusvârasamyuktam*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
dvâvinço[10] *'dhyâyah*

(1) G M om (2) W *ca samyogapûrveram* [3] W B *laghû* [4] W om [5] G M *antam* (6) W om (7) G M *tadbhinnam* (8) O om, W *yuktam* only (9) B om, G M *anusvârayogavirahitam* [10] G M O *dvitîyapraçne daçamo*

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah. varnânâm viçeshotpattir ucyata ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah. varnânâm viçesho varnaviçeshah tasyo 'tpattih sâ tatho 'ktâ*

It was hardly worth while to give a rule introductory to so very brief a treatment of the subject as is here to follow

अनुप्रदानात्संसर्गात्स्थानात्करणविन्ययात् ।
जायते वर्णवैशेष्यं परिमाणाच्च पञ्चमाद् इति ॥ २ ॥

2 The differentiation of articulate sounds arises from emission, closure, position, disposition of producing organ, and, fifthly, from quantity

That is to say, according as any sound is different from another in respect to one or more of these five constituent or determining elements, so its nature or quality is different The *anupradâna* is the emitted material, whether tone, breath, or the intermediate *h*-sound (ii 8–10), by *sañsarga* (a term not elsewhere used) is doubtless intended the degree of approximation of the articulating organs, as contact (*sparçana*, ii 33), approach (*upasañhâra*, ii 31), and the like (ii 14,16,45 etc), *sthâna*, 'place, position,' and *karana*, 'producing organ,' are the familiar names given respectively to the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth by whose contact or approach the sound receives its articulate character (*vinyaya*, which the commentator explains by *vinyâsa* [B reads this in the rule itself], seems to be added more to make up the verse than for the sake of its meaning), *parimâna*, 'measure' (used only here), is synonymous with *kâla*, 'time, quantity' (see i 31–37) The commentator takes *a* as an example, and says of it that its "emitted material" is tone, its "closure," in the throat, its "position," the two jaws, and its "disposition of producing organ," the two lips Excepting in the first item, this is blundering work *a* is, of all the alphabetic sounds, the one least easy to try by the tests laid down in this rule, and the commentator would have done well to choose some more manageable illustration

वर्णपृक्तः शब्दो वाच उत्पत्तिः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Sound combined with articulation is the origin of voice

The commentator defines *prkta* by *miçra*, 'mixed,' and *utpatti*

---

2 *anupradânâdibhih pañcabhih*[1] *karanâis varnavâiçeshyam*[2] *jâyate akârasya tâvad anupradânam nâdah samsargah kanthe sthânam hanû karanavinyaya*[3] *oshthâu vinyayo nâma vinyâsah · parimânam*[4] *mâtrâkâlah evam sarvavarnânâm boddhavyam viçeshabhâvo*[5] *vâiçeshyam varnânâm vâiçeshyam varnavâiçeshyam*[6]

[1] G M om [2] G M O *-nânâm v-* [3] O *-nyasa* [4] W O *parim-*, as also (with T) in the rule [5] G M O *-shasya bh* [6] W O om , G M *tatha*

3 *prkto miçra ity arthah varnamiçrah*[1] *çabdo vâco vâkyasyo*

by *upâdâna* and *kârana*, 'cause' This combination denies the quality of voice to the mere "sound" of drums and the like

सप्त वाच स्थानानि भवन्ति ॥ ४ ॥

4 Of voice, there are seven qualities

Here is a different and expanded version of the doctrine of three qualities, as laid down above, in rule xxii 11 The following rules give the details The commentator gives of *sthâna* the lucid definition "those whereby the voice is put to use, and that wherein it stands—that is *sthâna*"

उपांशुध्याननिमदोपब्दिमन्मन्द्रमध्यमताराणि ॥ ५ ॥

5 Namely, inaudible, murmur, whisper, mumbling, soft, middle, and loud

The rules that follow define the senses in which we are to understand the terms here given They indicate plainly enough a continual progression, from inaudible and merely mental utterance up to loud and distinct speaking, but it is not easy to find words which shall represent them closely

करणावदशब्दममनःप्रयोगमुपांशु ॥ ६ ॥

6 "Inaudible" is without sound, without application of mind, but with articulating action

The commentator explains *karanavat* by *prayatnavat*, 'with effort,' and states its object to be to deny absolute silence to the *upânçu* "Without sound" signifies the exceeding littleness of

---

'tpattir upâdânam[1] *kâranam bhavati varnaprkta iti kim dundubhyâdiçabdânâm vâkyatâ*[3] *mâ bhûd iti*

[1] MSS *-tra* [2] B G M O *-na* [3] B *tvam*

4 *'vacah sapta sthânâni bhavanti*[1] *tâny uttarasûtre vakshyante yâir vâk*[2] *prayujyate*[3] *yasminç ca tishthati tat*[4] *sthânam tâni yathâkramam udâharishyâmah*

[1] G M om [2] B *-kyam* [3] B *yuj*, W O add *se* [4] O om

5 *upânçv iti prathamam vâca sthânam dhvâna*[1] *iti dvitîyam nimada*[2] *iti trtîyam evam itarâny api nâmatah saptâi 'tâni sthânâni jânîyât uparitanam*[3] *sûtram ârabhya pratyekam eshâm lakshanam*[4] *vakshyate*[5]

[1] O *-nam*, G M *-nam* [2] O *-dam* [3] B O *na* [4] G M *sthânânâm* [5] G M *lak-*

6 *karanavat prayatnavad ity arthah nâ 'sti çabdo dhvanir asminn ity*[1] *açabdam*[2] *manasâ prayogo manahprayogah*[3]. *nâ 'sti*

sound in this mode of utterance "Without application of mind" excludes any intentional use of *udâtta* etc This last is not very satisfactory, and, indeed, we should as soon expect the contrary term, *manahprayoga*, 'with application of mind,' to be read, as indicating an utterance in which the mind does its full part, though not the voice also (G M, in fact, read it in the rule)

अक्षरव्यञ्जनानामनुपलब्धिर्ध्वानः ॥ ७ ॥

7 "Murmur" is inaudibleness of syllables and consonants

The commentator explains *akshara*, 'syllables,' as meaning here 'vowels,' but there seems no need of refusing the word its ordinary signification Inaudibleness, we are further told, being a characteristic of *upânçu* also, it is here again specified in order to teach that there is no actual sound heard Of what follows, a great part has dropped out in B G M, and is much corrupted in the other two manuscripts, so as to be very obscure The separate mention of syllables and consonants is for the sake of clearness (?), and indicates exceeding inaudibleness and there is added a comparison with tame and wild cattle, of which I fail to make any sense Others say that the inaudibleness is of *s*, *h*, and so on All of which is very trivial and unedifying

उपलब्धिर्निमदः ॥ ८ ॥

8 "Whisper" is their audibleness

---

manahprayogo yasminn[4] *ity amanahprayogam*[5] [6]*vâca sthânam îdrçam*[6] *upânçv ity upadiçyate tatra karanavad iti tûshnîmbhâvanivrttyartham*[7] *açabdam iti çabdasyâ 'tyantâlpatârtham*[8] *amanahprayogam ity udâttâdînâm sâmkalpikaprayogapratishedhârtham*[9]

[1] W B put before *asmin* [2] G M *-dah* [3] W *manah*, B *-gah stvam*, O *manasah pr-* [4] G M O *'sminn* [5] G M *gah* [(6)] W *sthânam vaca ichvam* [7] G M *thah* [8] G M *thah* [9] G M *samkalpakaprati*, B G M *-thah*

7 *aksharâni svarâh aksharânâm vyañjanânâm*[1] *câ 'nupalabdhir dhvâno nâma dvitîyam vâca sthânam upânçulakshane 'py anupalabdhâu satyâm punarvacanam*[2] *açabdopalabdhividhânârtham*[3] [4]*aksharavyañjanânâm bhedagrahanam*[5] *abhikhyârtham*[6] *atyantânupalabdhir*[7] *ity arthah* [8] *anye tv*[9] *âhuh* [4] *aksharavyañjanânâm savisarjanîyâdînâm*[10] *anupalabdhir iti*

[1] G M *svarânâm* [2] W B *cana*, O *-canam* [3] W B O *çabd-*, G M *rthah* [(4)] B G M om [5] O *bhedena gr-* [6] W *âbhakshayyayartham*, O *âbh* [7] O *-ntapal-* [8] W ins *yâmanyasya paçor araranyasya pi tûcyam iti*, O ins *yatha na grâmyasya paçor ante nâranyasâdhyetacyam iti* [9] O om *tu* [10] G M *vis*

8. *aksharavyañjanânâm upalabdhir nimado nâma trtîyam vâça sthânam bhavati*

I have rendered *nimada* by 'whisper' rather at a venture: whether the word accurately represents it or not is at any rate of very small consequence.

सशब्दमुपब्दिमत् ॥ ९ ॥

9. "Mumbling" is the same, with sound.

Çabda would seem to be used here in the sense of *nâda*, 'tone,' if the definition is to be made anything of; the term *upabdimat* is found in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ (at iii 1. 9[1]), used in antithesis to *upânçu*.

उरसि मन्द्रं कण्ठे मध्यमं शिरसि तारम् ॥ १० ॥

10. "Soft" is in the chest, "middle" in the throat, "loud" in the head.

The South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) divide this rule into three, and break up the comment into three corresponding parts, without other change. I presume that the treatment of the whole as one rule is more original; the subject joins on, as it were, to rule xxii. 11, and gives the received doctrine as to the mode of production of the three qualities of voice there laid down. And the distinction of the four other qualities by which "soft" shades off into utter inaudibility is a later addition to the doctrine—one of those pieces of useless over-refinement which are thoroughly characteristic of the Hindu mode of working.

The commentator points out that the first four of the seven *sthânas* described in this chapter are used "in sacrifices etc.," and the last three, at the morning, noon, and evening *savanas*, or soma-libations, respectively. And he quotes "from the Çikshâ" a pair of verses which are found in the Rik-version of the *pâninîya* Çikshâ (verses 36,37; see Weber's Indische Studien, iv. 363–4), to the effect that "in early morning, one must always read with chest-tone, resembling the growl of the tiger; at noon, with throat-tone,

9. [1] *aksharavyañjanânâm saçabdam upalabdhir*[2] *upabdiman*[3] *nâma caturtham vâca sthânam bhavati*[4].

[1] G. M. ins. *çabdena saha vartata iti saçabdam*. [2] W. O. om.; B. *-bdhiman*. [3] B. om. [4] W. B. O. om.

10. *yatro 'rasi sthâne prayoga upalabhyate tan mandram nâma*[1] *vâcah pañcamam*[2] *sthânam*.[3] *yatra kanthe sthâne prayoga upalabhyate tan madhyamam nâma shashtham vâca sthânam*.[4] *yatra çirasi sthâne prayoga upalabhyate tat târam nâma saptamam vâca sthânam*.[5] *eteshv âditaç caturnâm*[6] [7]*yajñâdishu prayogah*[7]. *mandram* [8]*prâtahsavana upayujyate*[8]. *madhyamam mâdhyandine savane*[9]. *târam trtîyasavane*. *çikshâ câi vam vakshyati*:

like the warble of the *cakravâka*, the third soma-libation is known as accompanied with loud tone, and this is always to be employed as head-tone, with sound proceeding from the head, and resembling the cries of the peacock, *hansa* and *kokila*."

The Rik Pr. (xiii. 17) teaches the same three *sthânas*, but calls the third *uttama* instead of *târa*. The Vâj. Pr. (i. 10,30) lays down their number and their place of production (assigning to the third the *bhrûmadhya*, 'middle of the brows,' instead of *çiras*, 'head'), but gives them no specific names. We cannot well avoid regarding them as involving a difference of pitch, as well as of force or loudness of utterance, the first is low, the third high and shrill, the other intermediate between them, or at the ordinary natural pitch of the voice. They answer to the lower, middle, and upper "registers" of a voice, and our modern musical theory recognizes an analogous distinction of chest-tone and head-tone. Each register, as the following rules go on to explain, is divided into seven tones or pitches.

मन्द्रादिषु त्रिषु स्थानेषु सप्तसप्त यमाः ॥११॥

11. In the three qualities beginning with "soft," there are seven tones each.

As synonym of *yama*, the commentator gives *svara*, doubtless here to be understood as 'musical note, tone of the gamut,' he adds 'acute, and so on,' which might be said blunderingly, as if the word he had just given meant 'accent' instead of 'musical tone,' or also intelligently, as implying the identity of accent with

---

prâtah pathen[10] *nityam urasthitena*[11]
svarena çârdûlarutopamena[12]
madhyandine kanthagatena câi 'va
cakrâhvasamkûjitasamnibhena
târam tu vidyât savanam[13] *trtîyam*[14]
çirogatam[15] *tac ca sadâ*[16] *prayojyam*
mayûrahansânyabhrtasvanânâm
tulyena nâdena çirasthitena[17]

[1] B om [2] G M O put before *vacah* [3] G M ins *bhavati kanthe madhyamam* [4] G M ins *bhavati çirasi târam* [5] G M ins *bhavati* [6] B *caturvarnânâm* (7) G M *shu 'pay* (8) W *nam up-*, G M *ne urasi prayu* [9] B G M om [10] W *ka-*, G M *than* [11] G M *-sthalena* [12] G M *rato-* [13] G M *-ne* [14] G M *-ye* [15] G M *-otthitam* [16] G M *tatha* [17] G M *çirogatena*

11. *trishu mandrâdishu sthâneshv ekâikasmint saptasapta yamâ bhavanti. yamâh 'svarâh udâttâdaya*[1] *iti yâvat. saptasapte 'ti vîpsayâ*[2] *ekâikasminn iti labhyate. ke te*[3] *yamâ ity âçankyo 'ttarasûtreno*[4] *'ttaram âha.*

(1) G M *svarâdaya* [2] W B *-yâh*, O *yâm* [3] W O *ne*, G M O put before *ke* [4] W *-tro*.

musical pitch—an identity which is the ground of their common appellation

The same statement, as to the seven *yamas* or 'tones' in each *sthâna*, 'register' or 'scale,' and the same identification with the *svaras*, are made in the Rik Prât (xiii 17) We are to assume, without much question, that the scales pass into one another by a constant ascending series, like the bass and soprano scales in our own system of musical notation

कृष्टप्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्थमन्द्रातिस्वार्याः ॥ १२ ॥

12 Namely *krshta*, first, second, third, fourth, *mandra*, and *atisvârya*

These are not the ordinary names of the seven notes of the Hindu scale, or *svaras* (for which, see Jones "on the Musical Modes of the Hindus," As Res, vol iii, Weber's Indische Studien, viii 259 ff), but they are, apparently, alternative appellations for the same thing, they are given by Uvata, in his comment on Rik Prât xiii 17, as used *sâmasu*, 'in the *sâmans*,' or 'in the Sâma-Veda' (Müller's Rik Pr, p cclxxii) Uvata calls the first *krushta*, instead of *krshta*, and the same is the reading of G M in our rules and their commentary, as also of T in rule 14 only (Muller, l c, p cclxxiii, marginal note, states *krushta* or *kushta* to be the reading of O also, but the maker of my collation does not note the fact, except once, under rule 14, in putting in on the margin a passage inserted out of place)

तेषां दीप्तिजोपलब्धिः ॥ १३ ॥

13 Of these, the perception is born of brightness

I have simply translated the problematical word *dîptijâ* literally, without claiming to understand what it signifies The comment throws no light upon it, nor do I get any from any other quarter The former says merely that the perception of each preceding one is "born from the brightness" of its successor, namely, the per-

12 *krshtaç*[1] *ca*[2] *prathamaç ca*[3] *dvitîyaç ca trtîyaç ca caturthaç* [4]*ca mandraç*[4] *câ 'tisvâryaç ca krshtaprathamadvitîyatrtîyacaturthamandrâtisvâryâh*[5] *te tatho 'ktâh* [6]*ete khalu*[6] *yamâ nâma*

[1] G M *krushtaç* (as also in the rule) [2] O om *ca* [3] O om *ca* [(4)] B O om [5] G M O om [(6)] B *krshtâdayo*

13 *teshâm* [1]*khalu saptayamânâm*[2] *uttarottara adîptijâ*[3] *pûrvapûrvopalabdhih*[4,1] *syât tat*[5] *katham atisvâryadîptijâ mandropalabdhih*[6] *mandrâc caturthopalabdhih caturthât trtîyah trtîyâd dvitîyah dvitîyât prathamah prathamât krshta*[7] *upalabhyate*

[(1)] W *dîptyopalabdhih* [2] G M O *saptasvarânâm* [3] B *râd-*, G M *-ran d* [4] O *pûrvop-* [5] G M om [6] W B *mantr-*, G M *nimadop-* [7] G M *krushtah*, O *krshtah ity*

ception of *mandra* from that of *atisvârya*, that of the fourth, from *mandra*, and so on through the series Perhaps the expression is nothing more than one violently figurative, signifying that each tone receives light from, or is set in its true light by, the rest, or the ones or one nearest it only, in that case, we should look for some word combined with *dîpti* to indicate the source of the light

Muller (under Rik Prât xiii 17, r decli) surmises that the present rule may mean the same thing with the rule of the Rik Prat *anantaraç câ 'tra yamo 'viçeshah*, which he translates 'in these three places (*sthâna*) a *yama* without another *yama* is undistinguishable' It is very doubtful, however, whether he is justified in rendering *anantara* by 'not having another,' and whether his rule is not rather intended to signify that the three scales pass directly into one another, the first note of the second being equivalent to an eighth of the first, and so on

द्वितीयप्रथमकृष्टास्त्रय आह्वारकस्वराः ॥ १४ ॥

14 "Second," "first," and *krshta* are the three tones of the Âhvârakas

This rule makes a *çloka* with the one that follows which is, of course, a marked indication that both are interpolated here The same thing may be inferred from the fact that rule 15 teaches nothing which is not found also in 16

The comment adds nothing whatever to our understanding of the rule

The Âhvârakas are mentioned in the Caranavyûha (paragraph 12 see Weber's Indische Studien, iii 257) as holders of one *çâkhâ* of the Yajur-Veda

मन्द्रादयो द्वितीयान्ताश्चत्वारस्तैत्तिरीयकाः ॥ १५ ॥

15 The four beginning with *mandra* and ending with "second" are those of the Tâittirîyas

This second half-verse, as already pointed out, is superfluous in view of the next rule, which treats the same subject, and much more explicitly

---

14 *dvitiyaç ca prathamaç ca krshtaç*[1] *ca te tatho 'ktâh*[2] *ete traya âhvârakasvarâh*[3] *syuh* [4]*eshâm*[5] *tâir eva prayogo veditavyah*[4] [6]*âhvârakânâm svarâ*[6] *âhvârakasvarâh*

O inserts the whole comment out of place, after that to the next rule [1] G M *krush* (as also, with T, in the rule), O *kush* [2] B ins *dvitiyadayah* [3] W *kasv-*, O *kârâ* (4) O om [5] G M *te-* (6) B *kashtâsvaranam*, G M *kasvara*

15 *mandrâdayaç catvâro*[1] *dvitîyântâh svarâ*[2] *mandracaturthatrtîyadvitîyâs tâittirîyakâh syuh*[3]

[1] G M O *-ra svarâ* [2] G M O om [3] O *teshâm tittiriyake prayogo veditavyah*

द्वितीयान्मन्द्रस्तैत्तिरीयाणां तृतीयचतुर्थावनन्तरं त-च्चतुर्यममित्याचक्षते ॥ १६ ॥

16 According to the Tâittirîyas, the *mandra* proceeds from the "second," and the "third" and "fourth" come next after this they style the tone quaternion

The order of the four tones is not made entirely clear by this rule, nor by the commentator's explanation of it The latter says that "the *mandra* of the Tâittirîyas is born or produced from the 'second,'" and, if the expression be used in a manner akin with those under rule 13, this would imply that the *mandra* came first, and the "second" after—which would, of course, accord best with the value of the two names *mandra* would thus be the lowest of the four *yamas*, as it is the lowest of the three *sthânas* But the commentator then goes on to say that the series of *yamas* thus "beginning with 'second'" is styled tone-quaternion and this would imply that the order is second, *mandra*, third, fourth Yet further, he adds that "second" is *udâtta*, *mandra* is *anudâtta*, and "third" and "fourth" are *svarita* and *pracaya* This makes the impression of a purely formal and unintelligent identification, or a forcing through of a parallelism between the four tones and the four accepted accents (which, however, are in respect to tone only three, since the *pracaya* is "of *udâtta* tone," xxi 10), without the slightest regard to the already defined tonic quality of the accents The comment, in truth, through this whole subject, seems to be written with a very insufficient comprehension of the meaning of the text see especially the rules that follow

Our attention is called to the fact that the preceding rule laid down the number of the Tâittirîya *yamas*, the present one undertaking nothing more than to describe their order, and that the intention of the last words of the rule is therefore simply to give a name to the series I have pointed out above, however, that rules 14 and 15 seem to have been put in by themselves, without any regard to 16

---

16 [1]*tâittirîyânâm dvitîyât khalu mandro jâyate · tadanantaram*[1] [2]*trtîyacaturthâu syâtâm* [2] *etad eva dvitîyâdi*[3] *svaramandalam*[4] *caturyamam*[5] *ity âcakshate yo* [6]*dvitîyah sa udâttah* [7]*yo*[6] *mandrah so 'nudâttah* [7] *yâu trtîyacaturthâu*[8] *tâu svaritapracayâv* [9]*ity arthah*[9] *anena sûtrena pûrveshâm*[10] *eva caturnâm svarânâm kramaniyamah kriyate catuhsamkhyâ tu pûrvasûtrenâi 'vo*[11] *'ktâ tasmâd atra caturyamam ity etat samjñâvidhiparam*[12] *iti pratîyate*

(1) B om (along with all the rule save the first three words) (2) G om [3] W B O *-âdih* [4] W B *ndanam* [5] G M *-yam* (6) B *dvitiyo udâttayor* (7) G M O om [8] W *dvit* (9) G M om [10] W *sarv*, G M O *pûrvoktânâm* [11] O om *eva* [12] W O *-dhânâparamam*, G M *dhânap*

The mention of the Tâittirîyas here, and in this manner, seems to indicate that the Prâtiçâkhya does not belong to their school, or concern itself with their *çâkhâ*, although, perhaps, both stand in an especially near relation to it. See what is said upon this point in the concluding note.

तस्मिन्द्वियमान्तरा वृत्तिः ॥ १७ ॥

17. In it, progression is by intervals of two tones.

I have rendered this rule according to what seems to me most likely to be its real meaning—although, at the same time, I do not feel by any means confident that I understand it correctly. If the Tâittirîyas acknowledge only four notes in the scale or octave, it seems natural that they should fix these at wider intervals from one another; and the phraseology of the rule is well enough calculated to express this. The verification or rejection of my version may be left till we shall better comprehend the Hindu musical system, and its modification or adaptation as here presented. I am, at any rate, persuaded that my guess is more likely to be right than either of the two which the commentator ventures. Of these, the first is nothing less than absurd: it makes *tasmin* refer to *anudâtta*, although such an antecedent can only have tumbled in out of the clouds, there having been nothing whatever to suggest it in the preceding rules; and renders 'in this *anudâtta* there is a being-within of two *yamas*; that is to say, in *anudâtta* inheres the quality of *svarita* and also that of *pracaya*.' And, as examples of this wonderful *anudâtta*, are quoted *sá naḥ parshat* (not found in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, but occurs Rig-Veda i. 99. 1, x. 187. 1–5, and Atharva-Veda vii. 63. 1), and *páry avadatám* (i. 7. 2[2]).

The commentator's second guess is so far better than his first that he gives the obviously correct interpretation of *tasmin*, as referring to *caturyamam* in the preceding rule; but he makes out the meaning to be that, in this series of *svaras*, two are contained in the interior, or are included between the other two. And he

17. *dvâu ca tâu yamâu ca*[1] *dviyamâu*[2] *dviyamayor*[3] *antarâvṛttir madhyavṛttis*[4] *tasminn anudâtte* [5]*bhavati svaritatvam pracayatvam câ 'nudâtte*[5] *bhavatî 'ty arthaḥ: yathâ sa ... pary ....*

kecid anyathâ kathayanti: tasmin[6] *caturyame*[7] *svaramaṇḍale dviyamântarâ*[8] *vṛttiḥ svaradvayasya*[9] *madhye vartamânam syât.*[10]

anudâtto hṛdi jñeyo mûrdhny udâtta udâhṛtaḥ:
svaritaḥ karṇamûlîyaḥ[11] *sarvâṅge*[12] *pracayaḥ smṛtaḥ.*

[13]*asyâ 'yam arthaḥ:*[13] *udâttânudâttayor*[14] [15]*madhye svaritapracayayor*[15] *antarâvṛttir bhavati:* [16]*tathâ kâuhaleyahastavinyâsasamaye 'pi*[16] *svaritapracayayor antarâvṛttir upadiçyate.*

cites a verse "*anudâtta* is to be known as in the heart, *udâtta* is uttered in the head, *svarita* is at the root of the ears (or of the throat, as G M have it), *pracaya* is declared to be in the whole member (or to belong to the whole mouth, W says)," the meaning of which he states to be that *svarita* and *pracaya* are found between *udâtta* and *anudâtta*—forgetting that under the previous rule he had assigned them a different position Further, he says that the interior position of *svarita* and *pracaya* is shown in Kâuhaleya's system of motions of the hand, as appears from the verse "the chief of the digits (i e the thumb) points out *udâtta* when its apex is applied to the root of the forefinger, when to the last but one (i e the ring-finger) and to the middle finger, it points out the *svarita* and the *dhrta*, when to the little finger, the *anudâtta*" This verse occurs in the Rik-version of the *pâninîya* Çikshâ (as verse 43 see Weber's Indische Studien, iv 365) the commentator does not regard it as a Çikshâ verse, but adds yet another which he claims to take from his Çikshâ, although it is not found in either version of the known treatise of that name (but compare verse 44, l c, p 366) "the little finger, the ring-finger, the middle finger, and the forefinger—these, along with the tip of the thumb, severally point out the grave, circumflex, *dhrta*, and acute accents" The *pracaya* is here twice called *dhrta*, and it again, apparently, receives the same name in the last rule of the chapter (unfortunately, I overlooked these passages when commenting on the term *dhrtapracaya* in rule xviii 3) "sustained" or "continued" is a sufficiently natural substitute for *pracaya*, as appellation of the accent in question

I do not understand precisely what and how much credit the commentator intends to claim for these two explanations in calling them (in his final remark) *mukhya* if he means that they are the best among a number which had been suggested and might have been reported, it is so much the worse for the rest

---

[17]*udâttam âkhyâti vrsho 'ngulînâm*
pradeçinîmûlanivishtamûrdhâ
upântamadhye[18] *svaritam dhrtam ca*
kanishthikâyâm anudâttam eve
[19]*çikshâvacanam api*[19] *câi 'vam vakshyati*
kanishthikâ[20] *'nâmikâ ca*[21] *madhyamâ ca pradeçinî*
nîcasvâradhrtodâttân angushthâgrena[22] *nirdiçet*
mukhyam eva[23] *vyâkhyânadvayam*[24] *etat*

[1] MSS om [2] W O om [3] W B O *mor* [4] G M om, B *medhyev*, O *madhyev* [(5)] O om [6] G M *-in;* [7] W B O *ma* [8] W B O *dvitiy-* [9] G M *-dviyamasya* [10] G M O ins *tathâ hi* [11] G M *kantham-* [12] W *sarvâsyah*, O *sayâsye* [(13)] W om, B om *asya* [14] G M *udâttânudâttasvarita* [(15)] W om [(16)] O om, G M *-leye hast-* [(17)] O om, G M *âkhyâti yathâ pradeçinîmûla udâttam upântamadhyayor madhye svaritan ca kanishthikâyâm anudâttam iti* [18] W *atecam-* [(19)] O *çikshâ* [20] O *shthâ* [21] G M *câ 'pi*, O *câ 'tha* [22] O *ângushthayena* [23] G M *evam* [24] W O *-nam dv-*

तामुपदेक्ष्यामः ॥ १८ ॥

18. That progression we will set forth.

The commentator declares *tâm* here to bring forward solely the word *vrttim* from the preceding rule (not that word with its qualifications), and the *vrtti* aimed at to be the fourfold progression of the *caturyama* taught in rules 16 and 19. This is, of course, forced and unacceptable. I imagine that, on the contrary, in the oral tradition of the Prâtiçâkhya, an uttered illustration of the four tones, separated by double intervals and so covering the whole octave, was given—which illustration, of course, could not be set down in the written text.

तच्चतुर्यममित्युक्तम् ॥ १९ ॥

19. That is what is called the quaternion of tones.

This is naturally enough explainable as a winding-up remark, after the exemplification of the four Tâittirîya tones notified in the preceding rule has been duly given. To the commentator, it is a mere repetition of what had been already stated above, in rules 15 and 16; and he excuses it as being intended, under the guise of a summing-up, to confirm the view laid down, and repel other opinions inconsistent with it. For, he adds, some people hold the doctrine that there are three *svaras* only, as appears from the half-verse "acute, grave, and circumflex are the three accents." This verse (from the *pâṇinîya* Çikshâ) was quoted in full above, under rule xxi. 1; and W. adds the second half of it here also.

The futility of this exposition, as well as of much that precedes it, will, I think, be obvious to any one. Instead of tracing and pointing out the relation which actually exists between the accents and the *yamas*, and letting us see what musical intervals are re-

---

18. *yad etad âcâryâiç caturyamam ity uktam tasya caturbhedabhinnâ*[1] *vrttir*[2] *nâma tâm upadekshyâma ity ucyate.* [3]*tâm iti tachabdena*[3] *pûrvoktavrttimâtram anukrshyate.*[4]

[1] G. M. *âm.* [2] G. M. *im.* [(3)] W. O. *tânimittaçabd.*; B. *tam iti labdhena.* [4] W. *-kathy-.*

19. *ity anena prakârena caturyamam ity*[1] *uktam. yady api mandrâdayo dvitîyântâ* (xxiii. 15) *ityâdisûtradvayena yamacatushtayatvam*[2] *siddham tathâ 'py upasamhâramishena*[3] *matântaranivrttyartham*[4] *drdhayati. yatah kâranâd evam anye manyante svaratrayamâtram:*

udâttaç câ 'nudâttaç ca svaritaç ca [5]*svarâs trayah.*[5]
[6]*hrasvo dîrghah pluta iti kâlato niyamâ aci.*[6]

[1] O. om. [2] W. *caturyayamacatushtayam pra*, B. *tayam na*, O. *cat-*. [3] W. *-shtena*, G. M. *hârena mi-*. [4] G. M. ins. *imam artham.* [(5)] B. O. *-ya iti*, G. M. *trayasvarâ iti manyante.* [(6)] in W. only.

garded as separating the different accentual pitches from one another, the commentator simply confuses the two together, and regards as said of the one what has reference only to the other

क्रमिविक्रमसंपन्नामद्रुतामविलम्बिनाम् ।
नीचोच्चस्वारसंपन्नां वदेद्धृतवतीं समां
वदेद्धृतवतीं समामिति ॥ २० ॥

20 It must be uttered with *krama* and *vikrama*, not hurried, not delayed, with grave, acute, and circumflex accent, with *pracaya*, and even

The commentator supplies *vrttim* as the subject of all these attributes, accounting for it as derived from rule 17, above This is hardly admissible, but what is to be understood instead is doubtful, depending upon the connection in which this verse may have stood in the text from which it was taken The same connection would perhaps explain what *krama* and *vikrama* are to be regarded as meaning the commentator defines *krama* by *dvitva*, 'duplication' (taught in chapter xiv), and *vikrama* as the accent of that name prescribed at xix 1,2, but it seems very unlikely that two things so dissimilar would be thus combined, or that a detail of accent would not be put in the second line, with the rest of its kind (compare rule xxiv 6, where *krama* and *vikrama* are found again in conjunction) *Dhrta* is defined as synonymous with *pracaya* compare the note to rule 17, above *Samâm* means, we are told, 'free from the faults of deficiency and excess in the matter of *udâtta* and the other accents'

There are slight variations of reading in the rule, T giving *adhrutâm* in *pâda b*, B *svara* for *svâra* in *c*, W G M having *vade* for *vaded*, and W *drutavatîñ* and T *dratav-* after it, but they are mere errors of scribes, as the comment plainly shows

---

20 *tâittirîyâhvârakamatanirûpako*[1] '*yam çlokah kramavikramâbhyâm*[2] *sampannâm kramo nâma*[3] *dvitvam*[4] *vikramas tu svaritayor madhye yatra nîcam*[5] (xix 1) *ityuktalakshanah adrutâm atvaritâm avilambitâm amandâm nîcoccasvârasampannâm anudâttodâttasvaritasahitâm*[6] *dhrtavatîm pracayavatîm samâm udâttâdibhir nyûnâtirekâdidosharahitâm*[7] *vaded brûyât* [8] *vrttim*[9] *ity arthah vrttim iti katham labhyate tasmin dviyamântarâ vrttir*[10] (xxiii 17) *itiprakrtatvâd*[11] *iti brûmah*

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
trayovinço[12] '*dhyâyah*

[1] W B *-rakam etan nir*, O *rakâmatan nir* [2] W *-vikrama* [3] G M O om [4] G M *dvitvaparyâyah* [5] O *-cañ syâd* [6] B *-ritapracayasamh* [7] B *nyûnâtirik-tâdi-*, O *nyunâdirek-* [8] G M ins *imâm* [9] B om [10] O *v* [11] O *-krtitv* [12] G M O *dvitiyapraçne ekâdaço*

CHAPTER XXIV

CONTENTS 1–4, the four *samhitas* or texts, 5–6, qualifications of a Veda reader and teacher

अथ चतस्रः सꣳहिताः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the four texts

A simple heading to the following rules

पदसꣳहिताक्षरसꣳहिता वर्णसꣳहिताङ्गसꣳहिता चेति ॥ २ ॥

2 Word-text, syllable text, letter text, and member-text, namely

Here is a very curious and problematical enumeration and designation of *samhitâs* The commentator divides up among them the teachings of the Prâtiçâkhya To the "word-text" he assigns chapters v–ix, xi, xii, and xiii 1–4—that is to say, the great body of rules for the combination of *pada*-text into *samhitâ* To the "syllable-text" he assigns chapter x, which has to do chiefly with such euphonic combinations of vowels as make one syllable out of two With the "letter-text" are concerned chapters xiii (i e except rules 1–4), xiv, and xvi, mainly occupied with the subjects of duplication and of the occurrence in the Sanhitâ of *n* and *ṅ*, otherwise than as these are results of the rules of euphonic combination And the "member-text" is said to be taught in chapter

---

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah catasrah samhitâ*[1] *ucyanta*[2] *ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah*[3]

[1] G M ins *ity* [2] O om [3] O *yate*

2 *padâksharavarnâṅgâçrayâç*[1] *catusrah samhitâh kramena boddhavyâh pañcamâdhyâyam* [2]*ârabhyâ " navamâd ekâduçadvâdaçâu*[2] *trayodaçasyâ*[3] *"dâu sûtracatushtayam ca padasamhitâ daçamo 'ksharasamhitâ trayodaçacaturdaçâu*[4] *shodaçaç ca varnasamhitâ* [5]*vyañjanaṅ svarâṅgam* (xxi 1) *ity eshâ*[5] *'ṅgasamhitâ etâç*[6] *catasrah samhitâh eteshv anyatra*[7] *vihitam nishiddham*[8] *ca kâryam sarvasamhitâsu*[9] *kuryât*[10] *yatrâ*[11] *"rshagrahanâdiko viçesho nâ 'sti*[12]

[1] W *-gâ ayâç*, O *-gâyâç* (2) W B O *ârabhya a nav-*, G M *ârabhya unapadâikâdaç*, W O *dvâdaça* [3] O *çâ* [4] W *rdaça* (5) B G M *ekavinço* [6] G M om [7] O ins *ca* [8] G M *nishidhyakañ* [9] B *tu*, G M *sarvatra samh*, O *sahit-* [10] G M *syât* [11] W B O *atrâ* [12] G M add *tatra kuryat*

xxi (rules 1-9), which prescribes of what vowel each consonant shall be regarded as "member" or adjunct, or lays down the rules of syllabication And it is added that whatever is prescribed or forbidden elsewhere than in [the rules belonging to each of] these is of force in all the different texts, unless there be some special restriction, as by the use of the word *ârsha* (ix 21, x 13) or the like

It is unnecessary to point out that the Prâtiçâkhya contemplates no such division of its rules and restriction of their application as is here made, and that, unless the distinction of texts laid down in the rule means something different from what the commentator explains it to be, it is trivial and worthless

नानापदसंधानसंयोगः पदसंहितेत्यभिधीयते ॥ ३ ॥

3 Conjunction of independent words by euphonic combination is called word text

The commentator first explains *samdhâna* as modifying *samyoga* in quality of a locative, and then declares the use of the two equivalent terms to be for the purpose of signifying the exceeding closeness of the combination (if, as I presume to be the case, the reading of B is here the correct one) And he quotes the rule of Pânini (i 4 109) as what "the grammarians" say upon the subject, giving the definition of *samhitâ* or combined text As example of word-text, he gives *agne dudhra gahya kiñçila vanya yâ te ishuh* (v 5 9[1], only G M have *ishuh*)

This interpretation makes *padasamhitâ* signify what we are wont to call *samhitâ* simply, in distinction from *padapâtha*, or *padasamhitâ* as usually employed, '*pada*-text'

यथास्वमक्षरसंहितादीनामप्येवम् ॥ ४ ॥

4 And in like manner with the syllable text and the rest, in accordance with their several names

The commentator explains *yathâsvam* as signifying 'it goes on without exceeding that which is its own,' and pronounces it a 'distinction of office or use,' thus, namely, the peculiar form of all the other specified texts is to be determined, the combination of inde-

3 *nânâbhûtayoh padayoh samdhâne yah samyogah sa padasamhite 'ty abhidhîyata ucyata ity arthah yathâ· agne.... ekârthayoh samdhânasamyogaçabdayoh*[1] *prayogah samdhânâdhikyârthah*[2] *tathâ ca vâiyâkaranâh*[3] *pathanti*[4] *parah samnikarshah samhite 'ti*

[1] G M *-yogayoh*, O *samyogesambadhânaç* [2] W *nâdikyâdityarthah*, G. M *sambandhikârthah*, O *sambandhikthâdhârthah* [3] G. M O *nâ* [4] G M *bhananti*, O *api*

4. *svamsvam*[1] *anatikramya vartata iti yathâsvam kriyâviçeshanam* [2]*evâi?tat*[2]. *evam aksharasamhitâdînâm api yathâsvam*[3]

pendent syllables is syllable-text—and so on And he quotes three passages from the text, by way of illustration *athâ 'bravît* (iii 2 11³), *adhishavanam asi* (i 1 5²), and *akshnayâ vyâghârayati* (v 2 7⁵ et al) Of these, the first is an example of the combination of two separate syllables (vowels) into one syllable, by a rule (2) of the tenth chapter, the second, of the occurrence of *n* after *sh*, by rule xiii 6,7, the third offers (like almost any other pair of words in the Sanhitâ) cases of the division of consonant-groups, *akkhsht-tna-yâv-vyâ* etc Or, by a different treatment of the successive distinctions, it is said that the combination of two vowels alone is "syllable-text," that of a vowel and consonant in one word is "letter-text," that of consonants alone in one word (consonants being "members" or adjuncts of vowels, xxi 1) is "member-text," anything else than these is "word-text"

It appears from all this that *samhitâ* is here used nearly in the sense of *samdhi*, 'euphonic combination,' and that these four rules have no significance whatever, being a mere bit of outside classification, in which some one has amused himself by indulging

गुरुत्वं लघुता साम्यं ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतानि च ।
लोपागमविकाराश्च प्रकृतिर्विक्रमः क्रमः ॥
स्वरितोदात्तनीचत्वं श्वासो नादो ऽङ्गमेव च ।
एतत्सर्वं तु विज्ञेयं छन्दोभाषामधीयता ॥ ५ ॥

5 Heaviness, lightness, evenness, short, long, and protracted quantity, elision, increment, and euphonic alteration, natural state, *vikrama*, *krama*, circumflex, acute, and grave quality, breath, tone, and adjunction—all this must be understood by him who reads the Veda language

---

svarûpam nirûpanîyam nânâksharasamyogo 'ksharasamhitâ [3]*nânâvarnasamyogo varnasamhitâ nânâṅgasamyogo 'ṅgasamhitâ*[4] [5]*kramеno 'dâharanâni bhanâmah*[6] *yathâ*[7] *athâ----* *adhi-....* *akshn-....* *kevalasvarayoh samyogo 'ksharasamhitâ* [5] [8]*ekapade svaravyañjanasamyogo varnasamhitâ ekapade kevalavyañjanasamyogo 'ṅgasamhitâ* [8] *anyatra padasamhitâ ity avântarabhedo vijñeyah*

[1] W B *svam* (2) G M om , O om *eva* [3] O *sva* (4) G M put also after rule 4 in the text of the Prâtiçâkhya, as if rules 5 and 6 (5) O om [6] W om , G M *vyâharâmah* [7] G M om [8] B om

5 *yad gurutvâdyashtâdaçavidham etat sarvam chandobhâshâm vedarûpâm*[1] *vâcam adhîyatâ pathatâ vijñeyam atha vâ chandobhâshâm*[2] *vedalakshanam*[3] *ity arthah tuçabdo 'dhyetrvyatiriktanishedhârthah*[4] *anena*[5] *tu sarvathâ vijñeyam ity arthah*

The commentator explains *vedabhâshâm* as meaning either 'voice having the form of Veda,' i e the uttered material of the Veda, or (according to another sense of *bhâshâ*) 'explanation of the Veda' The particle *tu* in the last half-verse (which I have omitted in translating, as being a mere expletive or *pâdapûraṇa*), he states to mean that the reader referred to must by all means understand all this, but not any one besides And he adds at the end that *vijñeya* indicates the peremptoriness of the rule, there being risk of harm in the absence of the required knowledge, as is shown by the verse "a *mantra* deficient in respect to accent or to letters" etc This is the familiar verse, found in the *pâṇinîya* Çikshâ (verse 52 see Weber's Indische Studien, iv 367-8), and quoted times innumerable in Hindu works, where the present subject is under consideration O alone adds the second *pâda*, "being falsely applied, does not express the intended sense," the rest is, "it, an uttered thunderbolt, harms the sacrificer, like the word *indraçatru* [when used by Tvashtar] with false accent"

The rest of the comment is occupied with illustration of the points referred to in the rule, along with now and then a few words of explanation For "heavy" quality (see xxii 14) is cited *vashaṭ svâhâ* (vii 3 12), for "light" (see xxii 15), *akuruta* (v 5 8^1 et al W B give instead *akurvata* [i 7 3^3 et al], which is less acceptable, as containing also a heavy syllable) *Sâmya*, 'evenness, sameness,' is defined as implying that, of two elements compared, there is—in respect to place and organ of articulation, quantity, etc —sameness (so G M , but B O read 'bigness' instead, and W has 'steadiness') what is really meant, is obscure, we may compare the use of the adjective *sama* in xviii 20 The examples for short, long, and protracted, respectively, are *gamayati* (i 7 3^4 et al), *vâyâv evâ 'sya* (vi 3 7^4), and *astu hî3 iti* (vii 1 6^1 G M omit *iti*) Elision is instanced by *îm 'ndrâsu* (iv 1 8^2 see above, v 12), increment, by *trapuç ca me* (iv 7 5^1 see above, v 4), euphonic conversion, by *sam indra no manasâ* (i 4 44^1 only O has *manâsa* a case under vii 2) To illustrate *prakṛti*, 'original condition,' are given three phrases, *agne dudhra gahya kiñcila vanya yâ te* (v 5 9^1 W B end with *kiñcila*, and G M with *vanya*, and G M O omit *agne*), *prapâ asi* (ii 5 12^4), and *na mi-*

---

gurutvam yathâ vashaṭ.... laghutâ yathâ akuruta sâmyam yathâ · sthânakaraṇakâlâdibhir[6] *anayor asti sthâuryam*[7] *iti. hrasvadîrghaplutânì ca*[8] *yathâ gamayati vâyâv.... astu .... lopo yathâ* [9] *îm.... âgamo yathâ trapuç....* [10]*vikâro yathâ sam.... prakṛtir yathâ. agne.... prapâ.... na....*[10] *vikramo yathâ vodhave kramo nâma dvitvam* [11] *yathâ yad....* [12]*yad....*[12] *svaritodâttanîcânâm bhâvaḥ svaritodâttanîcatvam* [13]*tad yathâkramam*[13] *nirdiçyate*[14] *nyañcam. gâm.... avadatâm vivṛte çvâsa* (ii 5) *ity uktaḥ*[15] *çvâso yathâ · pâ-.... saṁvṛte*[16] *kaṇṭhe nâdaḥ kriyata* (ii 4) *ity*

thum abhavan (v 3 6[2] G M omit *na*) Of these, the second is a case under x 13, the third, under x 18 both exhibiting a vowel which irregularly remains *prakrtyâ*, or exempt from alteration But the particular bearing of the first example on the point of *prakrti* is more obscure the phrase is one in which the *samhitâ*-reading is (except in respect to accent) the same with the *pada*, and this, probably, is the reason why it is taken Compare the comment and note to v 2, where this part of the rule now in hand is quoted For *vikrama* is given the word *vódhavê* (i 6 2[1] et al), of which the second syllable has the accent called *vikrama*, by xix 1 *Krama* is again (as under xxiii 20) defined as 'duplication,' and a phrase is quoted containing a case that calls for duplicated utterance, *yad vâi hotâ* (iii 2 9[1] i e *yad dvâi*, by xiv 1) O adds another of like character, *yad venoh* (v 1 1[4]) We are permitted to doubt, however, here as at xxiii 20, whether these terms were intended by the maker of the rule in the sense which the commentator assigns to them The three accents are instanced, in their order as mentioned, by *nyâñcam* (v 5 3[2]), *gâ'm vâ'vá tâ'u tât* (i 7 2[2]), and *avadatâm* (i 7 2[2]) Reference is made to rule ii 5 as defining "breath," and as example of breath-sounds, or surd consonants, is cited *pûshâ te* (i 1 2[2] B has instead *pûte*, and W *purte*, which occurs at iv 7 13[5]) Rule ii 4, again, is referred to as defining "tone" or sonant utterance, and the example is *bhâgadhe bhâgadhâh* (ii 5 6[6]) Finally, *angam*, which I have rendered 'adjunction,' is interpreted as alluding to the subject of syllabication (xix 1 etc), and a phrase is quoted, *tam matsyah prâ 'bravît* (ii 6 6[1]), which we are to divide *tam-mat-thsyaḫ-prâb bra-vît*

The verses composing this rule are found in a passage prefixed to the proper text of the Rik Prât (see Müller's edition, p viii)

पदक्रमविशेषज्ञो वर्णक्रमविचक्षणः ।
स्वरमात्राविभागज्ञो गच्छेदाचार्यसंसदं
गच्छेदाचार्यसंसदमिति ॥ ६ ॥

6 He who understands the distinctions of the *pada krama*, who is versed in the *varna krama*, and knows the divisions of accent and quantity, may go and sit with the teachers

---

ukto nâdo yathâ bhâg-- - *vyañjanañ svarângam* (xxi 1) *ity uktam angam yathâ tam- - - -* *vijñeyatvam*[17] *iti*[18] *nitya-vidhih vipakshe bâdhât mantro hînah svarato varnato ve*[19] *'tyâdi*[20]

[1] G M *dasvar* [2] O *shâ* [3] W O *nat*, G M *nam* [4] W *kta iti nish* [5] G M *anenâ 'dhiyata* [6] G M *sthanakâl* [7] B O *sthâulyam*, G M *ti samyam* [8] G M O om [9] W ins *etat sarvam tu vijñeyam chandobhavadhâyata* [(10)] B om [11] G M ins *tad* [(12)] in O only [(13)] W *padakr* O *tad yatha* [14] O om [15] MSS *tam* [16] W om [17] G M O -*yam* [18] G M *ita* [19] O *vu* [20] W *dinâ*, B *dina nama*, O *mithyâ prayukto na tam artham âha ty adinam*

This verse also is prefixed to the Rik Prât (Müller, p viii)

The commentator gives a merely mechanical explanation of the two terms composing the first half-verse, without telling us what he understands them really to mean Doubtless the *pada-krama* is that which is commonly known as the "*krama*-text," and for the construction of which the other Prâtiçâkhyas (Rik Pr x, xi, Vâj Pr iv 179–194, Ath Pr iv 101–126) give full directions, and the *varna krama* is the text with duplicated consonants, according to the rules of our fourteenth chapter The compound *svaramâtrâvibhâga* we are taught to treat as a dependent one, we might also be tempted to regard it as copulative, and to understand *vibhâga* in the sense of 'separation' (as in *pada*-text etc), as in the only other place where it occurs in the treatise (iii 1) "Going to the assembly of teachers" is interpreted to signify not merely the sitting with them on earth, but the enjoyment with them of the abode of felicity, the *brahmaloka*—it being explained (except in G M) that "the teachers" are Vyâsa and his like Then, *apropos* of this promise of heaven to those versed in the class of subjects of which the Prâtiçâkhya treats, the commentator proceeds to quote from various *purânas* and kindred works the praises and promises there given to those who teach the Veda

Thus, from the Garuda-purâna "Of all kinds of knowledge, that of the Veda is called highest, hence, he who communicates that wins heaven and final beatitude As chief of all sciences has been produced the *brahma*-science, hence, he who is devoted to giving it will receive the whole recompense of giving" From the Devî-purâna "To those twice born, the Veda is the chief means

---

6 [1]*padânâm kramah padakramah*[2] *tasya viçeshah tam jânâtî 'ti padakramaviçeshajñah varnânâm kramo varnakramah*[3]· *tasmin vicakshano nipuno varnakramavicakshanah*[4] *svarâç ca* [5]*mâtrâç ca*[5] *svaramâtrâh tâsâm vibhâgah tam jânâtî 'ti svaramâtrâvibhâgajñah*[1] *mâtrâçabdena kâlaviçeshah kaçcid ucyate*· *so*[6] *'pi caturanur*[7] *ityâdishu*[8] *evamvidhah purusha âcâryasamsadam* [9] *gachet* [10]*âcâryâ*[11] *vyâsâdayah*[10] *teshâm* [12] *brahmaloke*[13] *sthânam* [14]*yaç ce 'dam*[14] *çâstram jânite so*[15] *'py âcâryatvât teshâm sadrçam*[16] *brahmalokam gachati*[17]

tathâ ca[18] *paurânikâ bhananti*[19] *gârudapurâne*[20]

âhuh samastavidyânâm vedavidyâm anuttamâm[21].
atas taddâtur asty eva lâbhah svargâpavargayoh
vidyânâm paramâ[22] *vidyâ brahmavidyâ*[23] *samîritâ*.
atas [24]*taddânaçîlaç ca*[24] *sarvam*[25] *dânaphalam labhet*[26]

devîpurâne[27]

veda eva dvijâtînâm sâdhanam [28]*yaçasah phalam*[28].
ato[29] *svâdhyayanâbhyâsât*[30] *param brahmâ 'dhigachati*.
[31]*tam eva çîlayet prâjñah çishyebhyas tam pradâpayet*
tadabhyâsapradânâbhyâm [32]*etat kim na*[32] *'dhigachati*[31]

of obtaining good things, hence, by application to the reading of the Veda one attains the highest *brahma* To that let him who is wise especially devote himself, that let him deliver over to pupils, by application to that and communication of it what is there that one does not attain?" From Yâjñavalkya "Above all sacrifices, and ascetic practices, and pure works, the Veda is the highest means of felicity to the twice-born ones The Brahman who, not reading the Vedas, expends his labor in other directions—he quickly falls, while living, into the condition of a Çûdra, and his posterity with him" (the latter of these two verses, which is not given by W B, is found in Manu, at ii 168) From the Mahâbhârata "Whoever shall repeat to pupils the religious, sacred Sarasvatî, he shall gain a reward equal to that from the giving of land and kine" From the Vishnudharmottara purâna "By imparting the Veda, a man attains all the fruits of sacrifices, by imparting an *upaveda*, he shares in the bliss of the Gandharvas" From the Brahma-purâna "That reward cannot be told in a thousand æons, which, oh sage! one obtains by even a very little teaching of the Veda" And from the Bhavishyat-purâna "The sonless obtains sons, the poor becomes rich, but he who is ever devoted to the study of the Veda is dissolved in the highest *brahma*"

Next we are told the characteristic form of the Veda "The Yajur-Veda is brown-eyed, slim-waisted, big-throated, big-cheeked, black-footed, dusky, born of the family of Kaçyapa" If there is (as may be the case) real meaning hidden under these apparently senseless epithets, it escapes my discovery

---

tathâ ca yâjñavalkyah

yajñânâm tapasâm câi 'va çubhânâm[33] *câi 'va karmanâm*
veda eva dvijâtînâm nihçreyasakarah parah
[34]*yo 'nadhîtya*[35] *dvijo vedân anyatra kurute çramam*
sa jîvann eva çûdratvam âçu gachati sânvayah[34]

mahâbhârate[36]

yo brûyâc câ 'pi çishyebhyo[37] *dharmyâm brâhmîm sarasvatîm*
prthivîgopradânabhyâm sa tulyaphalam açnute

vishnudharmottare 'pi[38]

vedadânâd avâpnoti sarvam yajñaphalam narah
upavedapradânena gandharvâih saha modate

brahmapurâne 'pi[39]

na tat[40] *kalpasahasrena gaditum*[41] *çakyate phalam*
yad vedadânâd âpnoti[42] *svalpâd*[43] *api mahâmate*

bhavishyatpurâne 'pi[44]

aputro labhate putrân adhano dhanavân bhavet
sadâdhyayanayuktas tu [45]*pare brahmani*[45] *lîyate*

vedasvarûpam ucyate

yajurvedah pingalâkshah krçamadhyo brhadgalah
brhatkapolah krshnânghris[46] *tâmrah kaçyapagotrajah*[47]

Once more, the *vedâñgas* and *upâñgas* are rehearsed the former, in the usual number and with the usual names the latter, as *anupada*, *ânupada* (?), *chandobhâshâ*, *mîmânsa*, *nyâya*, and *tarka*—the first two of these last are elsewhere called *pratipada* and *anupada* (see Weber's Indische Studien, iii 260–261, and the St Petersburg Lexicon)

With this, in W B, the Tribhâshyaratna ends, but G M O have an added passage, the bearing of which is not in all points quite clear to me It begins with stating that he who reads the Veda thus accompanied by the *añgas* and *upâñgas*, and with knowledge of the characteristic form and family, becomes purified A verse then follows, in which it appears to be laid down how far the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya have force namely, as regards other texts, and passages which are not the subject of *sûtras* and are of human authorship (?) By way of illustration, nine passages are quoted, not one of which is to be found in the Sanhita proper, although five are from its endings of sections, or the summaries of words with which the divisions of sections (half-centuries, *kandikâs*) conclude they are *pra nakshatrâya devyâya* (G M omit *devyâya*, and O begins *anaksh-*), *sa im mamâda mahi karma kartave* (O omits *karma* Taittirîya-Brâhmana ii 5 8[9], Rig-Veda ii 22 1), *mahi-saptadaçenâ-'vasyuvâtâh* (from the ending of iv 4 12), *api-sida-mithuny ashtâu ca* (from the ending of vi 5 8), and *asminns-tanuva-stuhi-pinâkam* (from the ending to iv 5 10) in these the rules are said not to hold good, and *sinhe vyâghra uta ya prdakâu* (Tâittirîya-Brâhmana ii 7 7[1], Atharva-Veda vi 38 1, Kâthaka xxxvi 15), *dvâdaçâ 'gnishtomasya stotrâni* (O *stotroni*), *âtmanâpura-nish-pra-çukraçocishâ* (from the ending of vi 4 10 G M stops at *pra*), and *uçmasî-posham ekânnavinçatiç ca* (ending of i 3 6 G M stop at *posham*), in which the rules are said to hold good So much as this, now, seems clear that the first two quotations in each class are given as coming from some other Vedic text than the Tâittirîya-

---

vedâñgâny ucyante
çikshâ kalpo vyâkaranam niruktam jyotisham tathâ
chandasâm[48] *lakshanam ce 'ti shad añgâni vidur budhâh*[49]
anupadam[50] *câ*[51] *"nupadam chandobhâshâsamanvitam*
mîmânsânyâyatarkam[52] *ca upâñgâni vidur budhâh*[53]
[54]*evam sâñgopâñgavedasya lakshanam sampûrnam*[54]

iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane
caturvinço[55] *'dhyâyah*
iti dvitîyapraçnah samâptah

(1) G M om [2] W B om [3] W B om [4] O om (5) O om [6] O *sâ* [7] W *caran*, O *-nuka* [8] G M *ity avadishma*, O *ity âvâdishmu* [9] O ins *sthânam* (10) G M *samsadam sthanam âcaryasya samsadam* [11] W B O *ryah* [12] O ins *ca* [13] W *-kam*, G M *ko hi* (14) B *pada* [15] B om [16] G M *sadanam*, O *samsadam sthâna* [17] O *gachet* [18] W om [19] W B *bhananti*, O *vadanti* [20] B *gar-*, G M *de p* [21] W B *mam* [22] G M *ca parâ* [23] W om (24) G M O *nato râjan* [25] B G M *rva* [26] W B *bhavet*, O *bhet* [27] O *tathâ ca dev*

Sanhitâ (I should guess that they would all prove to occur in the Brâhmana or Âranyaka), and that the first class are offered as containing cases of combination at variance with the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya, while in the second class these rules are observed throughout. Thus, in the first example, vii 4 would require *naksh-* after *pra*, in the second, v 12 would require *îm 'amâda*, in the third, the s of *sapta* should be *sh* by vi 2, in the fourth, the *î* of *mithunî* should remain unchanged by x 18, in the fifth, *asmin* is not included among the words which by vi 14 have an increment of *s* before *t*. In the other class, on the contrary, *agnishtomasya* follows vi 2, *nish pra* is by viii 24 and 35 (see the comment to viii 35, where the passage is quoted as illustration), and *uçmasî* by iii 13, the first example has nothing but cases under the general laws of euphony. I conjecture, then, that the *na* in the second line of the introductory verse is to be amended to *ca*, and that we are instructed that the rules of the treatise are followed, outside the Sanhitâ proper, only according to the nature of each particular case, or even by arbitrary choice. If there is any definite system according to which the phonetic peculiarities of the Sanhitâ are observed or neglected in putting together the endings of sections and other divisions, I, at any rate, have not been at the pains to study it out, and the work belongs rather to an editor of the Sanhitâ than to an editor of the Prâtiçâkhya. It seems somewhat strange to find the prolonged *î* of *uçmasî* retained in the ending, while the uncombinable character of the final of *mithunî* is neglected.

There can be little question that the passage here treated is an appendage to the proper text of the Tribhâshyaratna, which, with the Prâtiçâkhya, takes in general (the only exception is at viii 35) no account of the subdivisions of *anuvâkas*.

By way of conclusion, the remark is added that the repetition of the final words of the rule indicates the end of the treatise. This is not to be approved, for the repetition is simply that which is made at the end of every chapter, and so shows nothing more than the conclusion of the chapter.

---

(28) W *yaçasah ph*, G M *çreyasam param*, O *çreyasah param* [29] G M O *tato* [30] G M *-dhyayanirutat* (31) W B om (32) O *tat hi yajña* [33] O *çucinam* (34) W B om [35] O *nadhitva* [36] G M O *te 'pi* [37] G M *çishyâya* [38] G M O om [39] G M O om [40] W O *tulya* [41] O *gani-* [42] W B *avap-* [43] W O *svâtmad* [44] G M O om (45) O *parabrahmani* [46] W *-nadhrih*, O *shtanundhi* [47] G M *kâç-* [48] W *-dânsi* [49] W *-dhaih* [50] O *prad* [51] G M *na* [52] W B O *-rkaç* [53] W *-dhaih* (54) B *sângopângavedasvalakshanam*, and put below, after *varane*, G M O substitute *evam sângopângam vedam gotrasvarupadijñanena* (G M *-divijñânann*) *adhiyanah puto bhavati* [*yadrchaya granthântare yathatattvam* (O *yatha tadvad*) *idam çâstram* (G M ins *yathavidhi*) *asûtriteshu* (O *sûcakeshu*) *sthâneshu paurusheshu na* (O om) *vartate tathâ hi pra--- sa--- mahi--- api--- asmins--- ityadâu na* (O om *na*) *vartate* (G *prav*) *sinhe--- dvâd--- âtm--- uçmasi--- ityâdâu tu vartate gached âcâryasamsadam iti vîpsâ çâstrasamâptim* (O *-traparisam*) *dyotayati* [55] B *nçatimo*, G M O *dvitiyapraçne dvâdaço*

Concluding Note

It seems desirable to present here, at the end of the work, a discussion and exposition of certain points which could not be connectedly or fully treated in the notes upon the rules.

A first important question is that of the relation of the Prâtiçâkhya to the known text of the Black Yajur-Veda, or to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ.

In considering this question, it is impossible to separate entirely the Prâtiçâkhya itself from its commentary. The former does not quote passages in its rules, but defines situations or specifies words, singly or in combination. Sometimes, indeed, either of these virtually amounts to the citation of a passage; but, in the great majority of cases, only the commentator can inform us what are the passages had in view. For example, we may regard *eshtah* (viii. 18) as in effect a reference to i. 2. 11[1] and vi. 2. 2[6]; but the words cited in viii. 8 (as *abibhar*, *akar*, *punar*, *pitar*) are indefinite in their indications, and it would be impossible to say that any given passage in the Sanhitâ in which one of these words occurs either was or was not contemplated by the makers of the rule. I shall therefore present in connection with one another the evidence derivable from the text itself and that from the comment.

There are four words or parts of words specified in the Prâtiçâkhya-text which are not to be found in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ: they are *stanutar* (viii. 8), *carshan* (xiii. 13), *jîgivâ* (xvi. 13), and *jighâsi* (xvi. 18). It is very remarkable, however, that each of these is a kind of reflex or varied repetition of another word preceding it in the same rule: thus, we have *sanuta stanutah*, *carman carshan*, *jigivâ jîgivâ*, and *jigâsi jighâsi*. And this, taken in connection with the fact that all of them appear to be in themselves ungenuine, never having been found, so far as I am aware, in any Vedic text, and being, at least in part, impossible or highly implausible forms, is sufficient to stamp them as probable corruptions, blundering intrusions into the Prâtiçâkhya, and of no force to prove that the latter was made for a text that contained them.

The cases are much more numerous in which the commentator declares the Prâtiçâkhya to have in contemplation phrases not to be found in the Sanhitâ. They are nearly all of this kind: in iv. 11, *viçâkhe* is declared *pragraha*; now the word is divided in *pada*-text, *vi-çâkhe*, and *çâkhe* is by itself a *pada* (according to i. 48); and therefore, unless there were some other *çâkhe* not a *pragraha* in the Sanhitâ, it would be enough to cite *çâkhe* alone in the rule; hence, as the citation of *bhâgadhe* (p. *bhâga-dhe*) just before implies that the maker of the rule had in view such a word as *uda-dhe*, whose *dhe* was not *pragraha*, so the citation of *viçâkhe* is declared to have in view such a word as *sahasra-çâkhe*, not a *pragraha*, "in another text." The phrases thus quoted from outside the Sanhitâ by the commentator are as follows: under iv. 11, *tas-*

mint sahasraçâkhe, *ûrdhve çastre pratishthite*, *brahmasâme pratishthite*, *agnidhrte*, and *prathamaje*, under iv 12, *paçuçrapanî* (or *bhasmaçrapanî*), under iv 15, *tam* (or *tâm*) *âhutî hvayante* (or *â-cayati*), *hûti punar* (or *manur*) *juhoti*, and *hutî tasmâd vivâh* (or *evâh*), under iv 37, *indrâgnî havâmahe*, under vi 5, *pramatis te devânâm*, under xi 3, as beginning of an *anuvâka*, *dhâtâ deve-bhyo 'smân*, under xi 16, *gayasphâno 'gnishu* All this, in my view, is false and arbitrary interpretation, the Prâtiçâkhya is less careful to limit itself to the *minimum citabile* than the commentator would fain have it, and it quotes, for example, the whole word *viçâkhe* instead of *-çâkhe* alone, simply because *çâkhe* occurs as *pragraha* only in that word * The same implication is appealed to by the commentator under xi 9,15, xii 3, xvi 12 (though without actual citation of phrases), to explain away what would otherwise be inaccuracies in the Prâtiçâkhya, *nalam plavam* is given under viii 16, in the course of the unjustifiable exposition of that rule, and *brahman*, though found in the Sanhitâ, is credited under xv 8 to another *çâkhâ* I do not regard anything in this whole class of cases as authorizing us to suppose that the Prâtiçâkhya had in view a text including anything not found in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ

Next, as to citations made in the commentary as if from the text to which the Prâtiçâkhya relates, but not found in the Sanhitâ And here I have first to report a few phrases which are among those occurring only in the manuscripts that came last to my hands, and which escaped my notice when preparing for my last search through the Sanhitâ, so that I have not looked for them (not having had the courage to undertake the long and tedious quest through the Sanhitâ a fourth time for so little) They are *achâvâkah* (xiv 5), *uccâ ratnam ayajanta* (ii 49), *tasmâd vairûpam* (xx 3), *darçyañ hi* (xxi 16), *naç cid ati* (xiv 10), *prâçnâti* (xiv 9), and *brhaspati sâtrapate* (xiv 10) Respecting several of these, it is doubtful whether they are not mere corruptions of phrases actually found and referred Then there is *kaviçastah* (xvi 2), instead of which, by an error, I sought and found *kaviçastâh* There remain, of quotations hunted for but not discovered, the following *adya vasu vasatî 'tî 'ndram eva* (x 10 O only), *anv enam mâtâ* (xx 1 Weber refers me for this to Çânkh vi 17 2 [?], Âçval iii 3, also Âit Brâh ii 6), *ahorâtre pârçve* (viii 7 only W and [?] O found in Tâitt Âr iii 13 2), *uta çravasâ prthivîm mitrasya* (v 12 only G M), *upârchaty askandâya* (x 9 only G M), *caturhotâ* (ii 25 Tâitt Br ii 2 3[2]), *brahmâudanam pacati* (x 7 Tâitt Br i 1 9[3]), *yaç chandasâm* (xiv 10 O only), *yâ prâcî dik* (iv 33 W B O), *varshâbhyah* (xiv 16 but I am not certain that I did not satisfy myself with *varshyâbhyah* and omit to search for this), *varshyebhih* (xiv 16 O only, and it reads *varshebhih*),

* The quotation of *dhâtâ râtih* (xi 3), to be sure, is more out of the way, and only to be explained as irregularly pleonastic, like that of *iyam eva sa ya* (xi 3), into which the commentator with equal arbitrariness, tries to interpret a very different meaning

çitikanthâya svâhâ (xiii 11 only G M), and *sa naḥ parshat* (xviii 17 Rig-V i 99 1 et al)

Along with these may properly be reported the few phrases which are quoted by the comment, confessedly or impliedly from outside the text contemplated by the Prâtiçâkhya Thus, we have under xviii 1 the beginning and concluding words of the Taittirîya-Brâhmana and the Taittirîya-Âranyaka (that is to say, of the latter, the concluding words, *âi 'va tapati*, of the fifth *prapâthaka*, with which, accordingly, to the apprehension of our commentator, the whole treatise appears to have ended), under xxiv 6 are given (by G M O) *dvâdaçâ 'gnishtomasya stotrâni*, *pra nakshatrâya devyâya*, *sa îm mamâda mahi karma kartave* (Taitt Br ii 5 8[9] etc), and *sinhe vyâghra uta yâ prdâkâu* (Tâitt Br ii 7 7[1] etc), in a quoted verse under xxi 6 is read *rtasya dhârshadam* (Taitt Br i 2 1[12] etc), and the comment to xiv 3 has *yo 'pâm pushpam veda*

Finally, we note that the comment gives, under xviii 1, a word, *bandhuḥ*, which ought to form the conclusion of the Sanhitâ, by its own count, but which is lost in the known manuscripts

In all this, again, there is no satisfactory evidence that the Sanhitâ of the Prâtiçâkhya or its commentators was other than the one we know The missing citations are in part found in a minority of the MSS, in part, they are perhaps corruptions, in part, they are likely to have been taken by an error of the quoter's recollection from some other Taittirîya-text—and the remainder, if there be a remainder, is too scanty to prove anything

When we come farther to inquire whether any part of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ as it exists was not before the authors of the Prâtiçâkhya, we seem to be brought to the same negative result There are, to be sure, here and there points in the text which the rules do not cover, but we have reason only to wonder that in executing so immense and intricate a task as that undertaken by the Prâtiçâkhya there should have been so few oversights These, so far as they have been discovered, have been pointed out in the notes, I recapitulate them here The word *rakshâ* (p *rakshâḥ*), at i 4 24, should have been exempted in some way from the operation of rule iii 8, which requires its *â* to be shortened when separated from the following word *Devî*, at vi 1 7[7], is made *pragraha* by the strict letter of rule i 61 (see under i 59), though the passage in which it occurs is not one to which that rule was meant to apply In the rehearsal of cases of elision or non-elision of initial *a* (chapters xi and xii), there are a couple of cases which the commentator is driven into attempting to provide for by forced and false interpretations of the rules (see under i 61 for *ye 'ntarikshe* at iv 5.11[2], and under xi 3 for *ye apsu* at i 4 33), and I have noted beside (under xii 8, at the end) only *so agniḥ* at v 2 3[3] as unaccounted for thus far (its companion case, *ûrdhvo asthât*, is read first in an *ukhya*-passage, at iv 2 1[4], as Prof Weber has pointed out to me; and *so agniḥ* may yet find a like solution) And in the enumeration of cases of interior *ñ* (see under xvi 26), two compound words appear to have been overlooked, *svâdushansaduḥ* (iv 6 6[3]) and *strîshansâdam* (ii 5 1[5])

I would repeat here, what I have already said, that my testing of the precise adaptation of the Prâtiçâkhya to the Sanhitâ is not absolute, since I possess neither an *index verborum* to the latter nor a *pada*-manuscript, and my results will probably admit of rectification in some points—but I trust not to any such extent as should invalidate the general conclusion.

This conclusion is, that the Prâtiçâkhya probably contemplates the same text, neither more nor less, as that which constitutes the Taittirîya-Sanhitâ, the only *çâkhâ* left us (unless the Kâthaka be regarded as another) of the many which formerly represented the Black Yajur-Veda. The name Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya, then, is both a convenient and a suitable one to be applied to the treatise.

If, however, this name be understood as implying that the text-book emanates directly from the Tâittirîya school, its propriety is much more questionable. Besides the numerous teachers and "holders of *çâkhâs*" referred to in the rules, whose names in some cases are related with those of traditional schools of the Black Yajus (see Weber's notes to the Caranavyûha, in his Indische Studien, iii. 256 ff.), three schools are mentioned by name, those of the Mîmânsakas (v. 41), Âhvârakas (xxiii. 14), and Tâittirîyas (xxiii. 15, 16). Now we do not expect the text-book of a school to name that school; its rules are those which apply "here," "with us," and only outsiders need specification; besides, the Tâittirîyas are represented as holding a doctrine which is not that of the treatise itself, although it is deemed of consequence enough to be set forth with a detail elsewhere unknown. We are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature, and relations of the "schools" of Vedic study and their accepted texts or *çâkhâs*, or the causes which have preserved to us so few of the latter, and of the school-treatises or *prâtiçâkhyas*; but we must of course assume that there were various degrees of difference among the *çâkhâs*, and that some were only infinitesimally unlike some others. And it is perhaps possible to point out certain minor points, in which the orthoepical form of the Taittirîya-text as recorded differs from that to be inferred from the Prâtiçâkhya.

Among these points we are not allowed to reckon the retention of *h* before surd gutturals and labials and before sibilants (against ix. 2), nor of *n* before palatals (against v. 24) and *l* (against v. 25), nor the omission of *t* (required by v. 33) between *t* and *s*, nor of the various duplications and insertions and aspirations taught in chapter xiv., since these are matters on which we are to expect discordance between theory and practice. Nor would it be safe to make anything of the consistent and emphatic acceptance in the Sanhitâ of *anusvâra* as an alphabetic element, while the Prâtiçâkhya wavers (see under ii. 30) between regarding it as such and as a mere affection of the preceding vowel. Of more consequence is the division of the sections or *anuvâkas* in the recorded text into fifties of words, or *kaṇḍikâs*, which causes the disappearance of more than one specialty of reading expressly prescribed in the treatise (e. g., of the *r* of *uçmasî*, at the end of i. 3. 6[1]: see under iii.

13) The retention of the final *v* of *av* and *âv* (from *o* and *âu*) before a vowel is also against the letter of rule x 19, and in accordance with a dissident opinion quoted in x 21 The *kampa* of a circumflex accent followed by a circumflex, consistently made in the Sanhita, is only mentioned in the Prâtiçâkhya (at xix 3) as taught by some authorities, nor is the form of the doctrine taught in full and clear accordance with the practice followed And it is very questionable whether the prescription of nasalization of a final protracted *a* (xv 8) is not merely reported by the treatise as made by certain specified teachers These are small matters, and few, and a degree of doubt, perhaps, hangs over them all, but they are worthy of notice, as being all that we have on which to found any discordance between the Sanhitâ of the manuscripts and that of the Prâtiçâkhya While, on the other hand, the points of accordance, even in matters which are most specially characteristic of the Tâittirîya-text, are very numerous and important *

Of course, the existence of other forms of the text besides the ordinary *samhitâ* is assumed by the Pratiçakhya Such a work without a *pada*-text at least as its foundation would be a thing inconceivable Our treatise does not give, as the others do (see add note 1 to the Ath Prât), formal rules for the construction of any of the other texts, its nearest approach to doing so is in the third chapter, where (see note to iii 1) it teaches us what final or initial vowels, long in *samhitâ*, are to be shortened whenever the word in which they occur is thrown out of *sandhi* with its next neighbor—a form of statement which applies to *krama* and *jata* text as well as *pada* The occurrence of such terms as *pada*, *nanâpada*, *iñgya*, *avagraha*, implies also the familiar usages of the *pada*-text, and the employment of *iti* is directly alluded to in iv 4 and ix 20, and indirectly assumed in the use of *ârsha* in ix 21 and x 13 What were the limits to the use of *iti* in the *pada*-text held by the school from which the Pratiçakhya proceeded does not appear its combination in the extant *pada* with the prepositions (thus *prá 'ti* for *pra*, *ví 'ti* for *vi*, and so on—and without restriction to the ten words which alone are allowed by the Pratiçakhya, at i 15, to count as prepositions) does not come to light anywhere either in the text or commentary Nor does the treatise chance to show whether its *pada* treated the *iñgyas* or separable compounds after the same manner as the extant Rik and Atharvan texts—writing simply *upa-âyavah*, for example—or as the extant *padas* of the Yajur-Veda (including that to the Taittirîya-Sanhita) and the one assumed by the Atharva-Prâtiçâkhya (see note to Ath Prât iv 74)—writing *upâyava ity upa-âyavah* The commentator, however, accepts and follows the latter method. Reason has been

* I have pointed out under rule ii 25 that the peculiar Tâittirîya orthography of such words as *suvar*, *tanuvâ*, *aghnyâ* finds no occasion for mention in the Prâtiçâkhya, nor is the very strange change of a final labial in certain words to a guttural (as in *trishtug indriye*, ii 4 11[2], *trishtug yâjyâ*, ii 6 2[5], *trishtugbhih*, v.1 4[5]) noticed anywhere, I presume (I have omitted to obtain distinct information upon the point) that in every such case the *pada* text also has the guttural—which would take the whole matter out of the sphere of the Prâtiçâkhya

found (under xx 3) for questioning whether in the *pada*-text belonging to the makers of the Prâtiçâkhya the peculiar rule followed by the known Tâittirîya *pada*-text as to the accentuation of its separable words was of force. The latter text is of a very peculiar, not to say an anomalous, character in many respects; in these it is supported by the Prâtiçâkhya, so far as the latter goes (I will instance as examples only the treatment of *yojâ* and *eva*, and other cases noticed under iii 15, of *nîcâd*, v 8, and of *ekâikayâ*, v 19): whether it does not contain other peculiarities which are ignored by the Prâtiçâkhya, and which consequently prove it not to be the one which this presupposes, I cannot say; but, from an item or two of information received from Prof. Weber, I imagine that it does so. The question will, at any rate, be cleared up by the discussion of the Tâittirîya *pada*-text which Weber, as I rejoice to learn, intends to add to his transliterated edition of the Sanhitâ, now going through the press.

I attribute it only to a (very unusual) awkwardness of statement on the part of the Prâtiçâkhya that it appears to leave a part of the words ending in an original *o* out of the category of *pragrahas* (see under iv 7), and so to deny them the right to be followed by *iti*, as they are in fact followed in the known *pada*-text.

The *krama*-text ("word-*krama*") appears to be mentioned in rules xxiii 20 and xxiv 5, and more unequivocally in xxiv 6 (all of them, however, of suspicious authenticity as original parts of the Prâtiçâkhya: see below); but it is only three times quoted in the comment (under vii 2, ix 17,20), and so makes but a small figure there as compared with the *jatâ*. Examples from the latter are given under iii 1, v 33, viii 8,12,16,35, ix 22, x 9,10,13, xi 9,16,17, xii 7, xx 2, and sometimes in considerable number and at great length; and once (under xx 2), where the commentator has occasion to mention the various kinds of text, he specifies *samhitâ*, *pada*, and *jatâ*, ignoring the *krama* altogether. This seems strange, inasmuch as the *jatâ* is regarded* as a secondary form of *krama*, and founded upon it; but the simple explanation appears to be that the *krama* brings up no questions of *sandhi* which do not arise also in *samhitâ* and *pada*, and so needs no special attention where only methods of *sandhi* are taught; while the inversions of the *jatâ* bring new elements into contact, and so create new cases of combination which require to be settled. If we may trust the commentator's interpretation, rules viii 12,35 are given expressly for cases that arise only in *jatâ*-text; under viii 16, he commits an obviously false explanation in order to reach a *jatâ*-case; under v 33, he makes a *sandhi* which the Prâtiçâkhya certainly never intended, because it is required by the letter of the rule, in a case which the makers of the treatise had apparently overlooked; under xi 16,17, the *jatâ* is resorted to, apparently with reason, for counter-examples to justify the form of statement adopted in the rule. The weight of evidence, upon the whole, is decidedly in favor of

* See Dr. Thibaut's "Jatâpatala," Leipzig, 1870.

the assumption that the peculiar *jaṭâ* combinations were had in view by those who constructed the Prâtiçâkhya—or, at least, by those who brought it into its present form. I would add, that it seems to me not unlikely that the term *vikrama* (in the sense of *kramavikṛti*) signifies the *jaṭâ*-text in rules xxiii 20 and xxiv 5.

The names of the divisions of the Sanhitâ, *kâṇḍa*, *praçna* (not *prapâṭhaka*), and *anuvâka*, are found only in the commentary (see Index); respecting the absence of the subdivision of *anuvâkas* into *kaṇḍikâs* see above, p. 427 (also under viii 35 and xxiv 6, where this division is acknowledged by the commentator). But the Prâtiçâkhya itself gives names to certain parts of the Sanhitâ, which names, for the sake of convenience, I will put together here, with a reference to the rule under which the part designated by each is stated (for further details of their occurrence, see the Index): they are *agni* (iii 9), *ishṭi* (iv 52), *ukhya* (ix 20), *graha* (ix 20), *pṛshṭhya* (ix 20), *mahâpṛshṭhya* (xi 3), *yâjyâ* (iii 9), *rudra* (xi 3), *vâjapeya* (xi 3), *vikarsha* (xi 3), *vihavya* (xi 3), and *hiraṇyavarṇîya* (ix 20).

A marked feature of the Prâtiçâkhya is its frequent citation of authorities by name. The list of names has been repeatedly put together by students of the Prâtiçâkhyas (in Weber's Indische Studien, iv 77–8, may be found notices respecting the historical and geographical indications derivable from them), but ought not to be omitted here also. It is as follows (including the cases of mention in the commentary, distinguished by an added c):

Âgniveçya, ix 4
Âgniveçyâyana, xiv 32
Âtreya, v 31, xvii 8
Ukhya, viii 22, x 20, xvi 24
Uttamottarîya, viii 20
Kâṇḍamâyana, ix 1, xv 7,8c
Kâuṇḍinya, v 38, xviii 3,4c, xix 2, (*sthavira*), v 40c, xvii 4,5c
Kâuhalîputra, v 40c, xvii 2 (Kauhaleya, xix 1c, xxiii 17c)
Gâutama, v 38
Paushkarasâdi, v 37,38,40c, xiii 16, xiv 2,3c, xvii 6
Plâkshâyaṇa, ix 6, xiv 11,17, xviii 5
Plâkshi, v 38, ix 6, xiv 10,11c,17, xviii 5
Bâḍabhîkâra, xiv 13
Bhâradvâja, xvii 3 (Bharadvâja, v 40c)
Mâcâkîya (or Mâyikâya), x 22
Vâtsapra, x 23
Vâlmîki, v 36, ix 4, xviii 6
Çâṅkhâyana, xv 7,8c
Çâityâyana, v 40, xvii 1,3c,4c,7, xviii 2
Sâṅkṛtya, viii 21, x 21, xvi 16
Hârîta, xiv 18,19c,20c,21c,22c

Of the three schools cited, the names have been already given (above, p. 427). And we have besides *âcâryâḥ* quoted in i 46, *eke âcâryâḥ* in v 30, ix 5, xiii 3, xiv 3,25, *eke* simply in i 47, ii 19, 27,47, v 39, viii 19, xi 19, xiv 33, xv 2,6, xviii 1, xix 3, xxi 13, *pûrve* in xv 9, and *sarve* in xviii 7.

The questions which all this array of authorities is called in to help settle may be classified as follows:

I. Matters of phonetic theory, with others of a general nature.

The nature of the tone of a circumflexed syllable, i 46–7, with this is combined an uncertainty of view of the Prâtiçâkhya itself, expressed in rules 44–5, there is nothing else like it in the treatise, perhaps we may best assume that rules 44–7 are a later intrusion. The mode of production of *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti*, ii 19. The quality of the *a*-element in *âi* and *âu*, ii 27. The phonetic character of *h* and *ḥ*, ii 47–8. The nature of the combination of *e* or *o* with (elided) *a*, xi 19. The occurrence of lingual *l*, xiii 16: this the comment vainly endeavors to make out an accepted doctrine of the Prâtiçâkhya. A denial of the enclitic circumflex, xiv 32–3. Nasalization of final vowels, xv 6–8: the comment treats rule 8 as the direct teaching of the text-book. Accent of protracted vowels (?), xv 9. Conception of the final theme vowel of neuters in *as*, *is*, *us* in the nom. pl. before *ñ*, xvi 16. Utterance of *âi* final in a single case, xvi 24. Degrees of nasalization, xvii 1–5. Utterance of accents and alphabetic sounds generally, xvii 6–8. *Kampa* between two circumflex syllables, xix 3–5. Use of the term *yama* for the nasal counterparts, xxi 13. Utterance of the syllable *om*, xviii 1–7. *Yama*-tones held by certain schools, xxiii 14–19.

II. Matters of *sandhi* or euphonic combination.

1. The most important cases in this division are two or three in which the views of different authorities are reported without any clear expression by the treatise of the opinion held, or the rule to be followed, by its school. Thus, with regard to the combination of a final mute with an initial *h*, v 38–41, where, indeed, the view first stated, as that of certain specified teachers, is doubtless to be regarded as that of the Prâtiçâkhya, notwithstanding the equivocal way in which it is put forward. Again, at ix 1, the dropping of final *ḥ* before a sibilant followed by a surd mute must probably in like manner, though referred to the authority of a single teacher, be taken as a binding rule. And it is hard to believe that rule x 19, prescribing the invariable omission of final *v*, was not meant to be modified by x 21. That the treatment of *anusvâra* as a distinct consonantal element is put by xv 2–3 upon certain dissidents, must not be looked at by itself alone, it stands connected with the general equivocal attitude assumed by the Prâtiçâkhya with reference to this vexed question in phonetics (see note to ii 30). Once more, the mode of duplication in groups beginning with *l* as reported in xiv 2–3, with reference to the authorities who teach it, seems to be acknowledged by a later rule (xiv 7) as binding: this interpretation, however, is not free from doubt.

2. In all other cases, the Prâtiçâkhya is liberal enough to record the opinions of respected authorities upon points as to which its own teachings are distinctly opposed to theirs. Thus, as to the treatment of *m* before *y* and *v*, v 30 and xiii 3 (the repeated mention of this shows it to be regarded as a view entitled to the most respectful consideration), the combination of *p* with *ç* and of *n* with *ç* before a consonant, v 36–7, the *sandhi* of *eshtar* with *râyaḥ*, viii 19–22, the treatment of *ḥ* before an initial consonant, ix 4–6, the utterance or omission of final *y* and *v*, x 20–23, the insertion

of a surd mute between spirant and mute, xiv 10–11, aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, xiv 13, duplication in certain specified cases, xiv 17–22,25–8 (but the comment treats 28 as the direct prescription of the authors of the treatise), and *vikrama* accent after *pracaya*, xix 2

Thus it is evident that, while this arraying of discordant opinions is a quite distinctive and a very interesting feature of our Prâtiçâkhya, it does not, except to a very limited extent, detract from the character of the latter as a consistent and positive record of the views of a school of Vedic study Nor is it fairly to be brought into any relation to the peculiar character of the Black Yajur-Veda, as a text of which the constituent parts had been gathered together more miscellaneously, and less fully fused into conformity, than the other Vedic texts No text could be so definitely constructed, and be made the object of so thorough and systematic study as the setting up of a text-book like the Prâtiçâkhya evinces, without assuming an established character, and being as authoritatively handed down and as accurately learned as any Vedic text

It is by no means improbable that a part of these citations of authorities have been interpolated in the Prâtiçâkhya after the latter ceased to be a mere body of practical rules for the guidance of a school, and, in virtue of its thoroughness and comprehensiveness, gained more the character of a phonetic "treatise" on the Black Yajur-Veda, and was used in other schools than that which originated it The commentator (as will be pointed out below) uses the citations as a cover under which to put upon the treatise certain doctrines which do not properly belong to it, and in other hands it may have undergone a like distortion in other directions

Accretions of other kinds to the original text of the Prâtiçâkhya are plausibly to be presumed in various places All the metrical rules (namely xvii 8, xxii 14,15, xxiii 2,14–15,20, xxiv 5,6) are to be set down without much question as unauthentic, they are proved such by their character not less than by their form, and several of them are found in other parts of the Prâtiçâkhya literature We may include in the same category, indeed, with considerable show of reason, the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters, and all that follows the twenty-first, on the score of content alone a part of their matter is inferior repetition of what had been given before, a part deals with subjects, and in a style, unsuited to a Prâtiçâkhya That there is room at least to suspect the intrusion of rules in other parts of the work has been pointed out here and there in the notes at this place, I will merely refer to certain rules which are put in strangely out of place, interrupting the natural connection of passages such are i 25–7,60, vii 13,14, xiv 12–3, xv 6–9, xvi 24, xxii 3–8, of these, only vii 13,14 are indispensable parts of a treatise like the present.

Another notable characteristic of our Prâtiçâkhya is its sparing use of technical terms belonging to general grammar, consequent upon its refusal to deal with words or classes of words according to their grammatical character, its laborious definition of its subject-

matter in the Sanhita by position and surroundings merely There are but two cases of its departure from this method namely, its use of *alopa* at xiii 15, and of *samkhyásu* at xvi 25, and in neither one is its success precisely of a character to make us wish it had gone farther in the same direction This peculiarity renders impossible any profitable comparison of its phraseology with that of other grammatical works

The general character of the Pratiçâkhya is that of an earnest, sensible, consistent treatise, thoroughly worked out and dealing with its proper task with completeness and accuracy, and confining itself quite strictly to that task There is no labored feebleness and artificial obscurity, as in parts of the Vajasaneyi-Pratiçâkhya, nor any inclusion of matters pertaining to general grammar, as in the Atharva-Pratiçakhya It has its minor inaccuracies and inconsistencies, its obscurities of *anuvrtti* inseparable from the *sûtra*-style, and its rules that seem to defy interpretation but these are inconspicuous blemishes, no one of the other works of its class is more thoroughly respectable throughout

Turning, now, to the more special consideration of the commentary, we have to note, as the most important point, a break of continuity between it and the Pratiçakhya The commentator is not the recipient of a certain tradition, that gives him surely and precisely the import of the rules which he has to expound, the text-book has come down to him as something authoritative and sacred, indeed, yet in some points obscure, so that he is in doubt as to what it means, in others imperfect, so that it needs emendation, in others not in accordance with the views held by him and his school respecting the text, so that these have to be interpreted into it

Thus, in the first place, the instances are frequent in which, to his own interpretation of a rule, he adds a different view held by other interpreters either without naming them (as under i 19,21, xiii 16, xiv 5,11, xvii 5, xxiii 7), or referring to one of his special sources and predecessors (as under ii 19,33), or setting off against one another the views of two of these, Vararuci and Mahisheya (as under ii 14, iv 40, viii 19,20,22, xviii 7) In a large proportion of the instances, it is true, the difference of opinion is upon some utterly trivial point, turning on the interpretation of a *tu* or the like, and only illustrating the hair-splitting tendencies of the native exegetes, but in some cases it is of more consequence, and once goes so far as to question (under viii 20) whether an authority referred to is Uttamottarîya or Dvavuttamottarîya Again, where a rule is really obscure, the commentator has sometimes, palpably, nothing more than guesses to give at its meaning, and ventures two or three of them (as under ii 2, xiv 22, xv 9, xix 5, xxiii 17), among which it would be hard to choose the least acceptable, or, if he gives but one (as under xi 19, xviii 4, xxiii 18,19), it is no less unsatisfactory There are yet other cases in which what seems to be the evident meaning of a rule is misapprehended and distorted,

without reason (as under ii 52, iv 4, v 29, vii 11, xix 3) Occasionally, false interpretations, of every degree of violence, are committed, for the purpose either of correcting an oversight or inaccuracy of the Pratiçâkhya (as under i 61, iii 1, viii 16, xi 3, xvi 26), or else of imposing upon the latter a doctrine which it was not intended to teach, but which is held by the commentator and his school (as under i 58, xiii 4, xxi 14,16) For this last purpose, too, advantage is sometimes taken of the citations of varying opinions so liberally made in the rules, the *dictum* of the quoted authority is declared to be approved in usage, or is even imposed upon the Pratiçakhya, to the setting aside of what the latter really prescribes Thus, Pâushkarasâdi's doctrine of the conversion of *l* to *d* (xiii 16), which belongs neither to the Prâtiçakhya nor to the Sanhita, is accepted, and the duplication of consonant-groups beginning with *l* which is ascribed (xiv 3) to certain unspecified teachers, and Plakshi's mode of treatment of a spirant before a first mute (xiv 17), which has as further result a misinterpretation of xxi 16, and a part of rule xiv 26, respecting the duplication of *l*, and rule xiv 28, to which a strange interpretation is given, prepared for by a yet stranger one of xiii 4, and rules xv 2,3, which require *anusvâra* instead of nasalization of a vowel, and the nasalization of a final protracted *q* (xv 8), and two rules (xviii 1,6) from among those which concern the utterance of *om*, and rule x 21, as to the retention of final *v*, is given the preference over 19, which requires its omission, and the first rule (v 38) as to the combination of initial *h* with a preceding mute is ratified, and, in the variety of opinions respecting the circumflex tone, one (i 46) is selected for approval In the few cases where the commentator does not express himself as to whether a rule is *ishta* or *anishta* (they are ii 19,27,47–8, xi 19, xix 2, xxi 13, xxiii 14–9), there may be question whether he means to have it regarded as approved, or thinks the matter of no consequence either way There remain the majority of cases, in which he stands by the Pratiçakhya, rejecting the intruded doctrine (for further details, refer to the words *ishta* and *anishta* in the Sanskrit index)

Besides these more serious cases of misapprehension or intended modification of the teachings of his text-book, the commentator is not free from the ordinary and characteristic weaknesses of his craft in India from feeble and puerile expositions, from attempts to find a wonderful pregnancy of meaning in some innocent particle or unintended difference of expression, from groundless etymologies, and the like, to these attention has been directed in the notes, and they are not of consequence enough to be recapitulated here

For determining the personality of the commentator we have no data whatever, and for his place and period we have only the references to other authorities, which, though too few and indefinite to yield any statable result, need to be put together in this note The three earlier commentators on whom the work is avowedly founded—namely, Vararuci, Mahisheya, and Âtreya—are repeatedly appealed to, especially (as has been pointed out above)

in the settlement of difficult or controverted points (for the details, see index) Vararuci is a name very common in grammatical literature, to identify our commentator with any other of the various individuals who have worn it would doubtless be daring in the extreme Nor does Âtreya, probably, stand in any definable relation to the grammarian of that name who is (see p 430) twice quoted in the Prâtiçâkhya itself From Pâṇini, rules are directly quoted under ii 12, iii 9, v 1, xiii 16, xiv 4, xxiv 3, and the *pâṇinîyâḥ* or the *vyâkaraṇa* are further referred to under i 15,53,57, ii 47, xviii 1 Pâṇinean terms are, further, *nañ*, i 60, x 22, *ṇic*, ii 17, *hal*, ix 24, *yaṇ*, xiv 4, and *lyap*, xxi 14 The Mahâbhâshya is professedly quoted under ii 7, v 2, but the passage given is actually from Kâiyaṭa's gloss A definition is taken from the Amarakoça under i 1 Kâuhaleya is quoted under xix 4, xxiii 17, and the Kâlanirṇaya under xviii 1 The Brâhmaṇa of the Vâjasaneyins is referred to under xiv 33, and extracts from the Mahâbhârata and various Purâṇas are set forth under xxiv 6

But the authority most often appealed to is the "Çiksha," by which the commentator intends a very different work from the *pâṇinîya* Çiksha, and one much more comprehensive He takes extracts from it, of a verse, or part of a verse, or more than one verse, under i 1 (three times), ii 2, xiv 5,28, xix 3, xx 12, xxi 1,15, xxii 13, xxiii 10,17 Among these extracts are (under i 1, ii 2, xxi 1, xxiii 10) several passages which are found also in the *pâṇinîya* Çiksha, and among the metrical extracts which are now and then given without specifying their source (under xiv 23,26,28, xix 3, xxi 1,6,15, xxiii 17,19, xxiv 6) are likewise one or two (under xxiii 17,19) which occur in the same treatise That the commentator is inclined to regard his Çiksha as of higher authority than the Prâtiçâkhya itself was pointed out under xx 12, that it was a work specially appertaining to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ may be inferred with probability from the words which it cites (under xxi 15) in illustration of the varieties of *svarabhakti*

ANALYSIS

I EXPLANATORY TERMS AND THEIR USE, INTERPRETATION OF RULES, ETC

1 *Terms and their use*

kara forms names of letters, xxii 4, of vowels, i 16, of consonants, i 17, exceptions, i 18 —*varna* forms names of letters xxii 4, includes short, long, and protracted vowels, i 20 —*epha* forms name of *r*, i 19 —*varga*, with first mute, forms name of series, i 27 —*a* forms name of consonant, i 21, of a cited word, i 22 —*aprkta*, a *pada* of a single letter, i 54 —*avagraha*, first member of a separable word, i 49 —*lopa*, loss, i 57 —*upasarga*, 'preposition,' includes what words, i 15 —offices of *ca*, *api*, *tu*, *atha*, *eva*, *va*, *na*, xxii 5–8

2 *Interpretation of rules and forms, etc*

an increment, or word having euphonic change or elision, put in nominative, i 23, or in its text form, i 24 —product of euphonic change put in accusative, i 28 —next element, or more, taken in case of doubt, i 25,26 —a cited *pada* means that *pada* only, i 50, but applies to it even when euphonically altered, or preceded by *a* or *an*, i 51–3 —rules for a specified passage apply only there, and peremptorily, i 59, but a series of three or more words, if repeated, reads as the first time, i 61 —*purva*, 'preceding,' and *uttara*, 'following' designate a word only under the specified circumstances i 29,30 —continued implication is of what stood last, i 58 —words to be combined, and rules to be applied, in their order, v 3 —a separable word treated as two words, except in enumeration, i 48 —an *aprkta* treated as initial and as final, i 55 —elision and euphonic alteration affect single letters only, i 56, after elision of *y* or *v*, no farther combination made, x 25 —in *pragrahas* and in enumeration of words containing *anusvâra* a cause in another word maintains its force, i 60

II PHONETIC ENUMERATION, CLASSIFICATION, DESCRIPTION OF ALPHABETIC SOUNDS, QUANTITY, ACCENT, ETC

1 *Enumeration and classification of alphabetic sounds*

nine simple vowels [*a*, *a*, *a3*, *i*, *i*, *i3*, *u*, *u*, *u3*], i 2, sixteen vowels [the above, with *r*, *r̂*, *l*, *e*, *âi*, *o* *au*], i 5, the rest consonants, i 6 —mutes, i 7, in five series, i 10, called "first" etc, i 11 —semivowels [*y* *r*, *l*, *v*], i 8 —spirants [*χ*, *ś*, *sh*, *s*, *φ*, *h*], i 9 —surd consonants, i 12, *h*, i 13, sonants i 14

2 *Mode of formation of alphabetic sounds*

general mode of production of articulate sounds, ii 2,3,7, xvii 7,8, xxii 1,2, xxiii 2,3 —difference of surds, sonants, and *h*, ii 4–6 —mode of utterance of vowels, in general, ii 4,8,31,32, in particular, of *a*, *â*, ii 12, of *i*, *i*, ii 20–22, of *u*, *û*, ii 20,24,25, of *r*, *r*, *l*, ii 18, of *e*, ii 15–17,23 of *âi* ii 26–8, of *o*, ii 13,14, of *âu*, ii 26,27,29 —similar vowels, i 3,4 —mode of utterance of consonants, in general, ii 33 34, of sonants, ii 8, of surds ii 10,11, of *h* and sonant aspirates, ii 6 9, of nasality, ii 52, difference of nasal quality in different nasal sounds, xvii 1–4, of nasal mutes, ii 30 —mode of utterance of consonants in particular of *k*-series, ii 35, of *c*-series, ii 36, of *t*-series, ii 37, of *t* series, ii 38, of *p* series, ii 39, of *y*, ii 40, of *r*, ii 41 of *l*, ii 42, of *v*, ii 43, of spi

iants, ii 44,45, of *h*, ii 6,9,46,47, of *visarjanīya*, ii 46,48, of *anusvāra*, ii 19, 30, of *nāsikyas* (*yamas* etc), ii 49–51, of *svarabhakti*, ii 19

3 *Quantity*

quantity of short and long vowels, i 31–3,35, of protracted vowels, i 36, of consonants, i 37, of *anusvāra* (or nasalized vowel), i 34, xvii 5, of syllables ("heavy" and "light"), xxii 14,15, of pauses and hiatus, xxii 13, of *om* xviii 1

4 *Accent*

general character of accents acute, i 38, xxii 9, grave, i 39, xxii 10, circumflex, i 40–47 xvii 6 —varieties of independent circumflex *nitya* or original xx 2, its quality, xx 9 *kshaipra* xx 1, its occurrence, x 16 its quality xx 9 *abhinihata*, xx 4, its occurrence, xii 9, its quality, xx 10 *praçlishta*, xx 5, its occurrence, x 17, its quality, xx 11 —enclitic circumflex its occurrence xiv 29–33, its varieties *pratihata*, xx 3, its quality, xx 11 *padavṛtta*, xx 6, its quality, xx 12 *tairovyañjana* xx 7 its quality xx 12 —*pracaya* accent, xxi 10,11 —*vikrama*, xix 1,2, its quality, xvii 6 —*kampa*, between two circumflexes, xix 3–5 —accent resulting from combination of two syllables into one, x 10,12,16,17, xii 9–11 —accent of *om*, xviii 2,3,5–7 —accent of protracted vowel (?), xv 9

5 *Syllabication*

division of syllables, xxi 1–9

6 *Mode and tones of utterance*

general mode of utterance xxiii 20, the three *sthānas* or qualities, xxii 11, the seven do, xxiii 4–10, the twenty one *yamas* or tones, xxii 12, xxiii 11–19 —tone of *om*, xviii 4

III SANDHI OR EUPHONIC COMBINATION

introductory, v 1–3, four kinds of combination, xxiv 1–4

1 *Final vowels*

final vowels not liable to combination, *pragrahas*, iv 1–54, x 24, special cases of uncombinable finals, x 13 18, protracted finals, x 24, their nasalization, xv 7,8 —nasalization of final vowels, xv 6 —the particle *u*, ix 16,17 —lengthening of final *a*, iii 2–6,8–12, of final *i* and *u*, iii 7,13,14

combination of simple final vowels with similar initial, x 2, of final *a* with initial vowels, x 4–9, exceptions, x 13, lost in certain cases before *e* or *o*, x 14, *i*, *ī*, *u*, final, x 15, ix 17, exceptions, ix 16, x 18 —combination of final diphthongs, ix 11,12,14,15, *e* and *o* with initial *a* (see also Initial vowels), ix 13, treatment of the resulting *y* and *v*, x 19–23, after their loss no further combination, x 25

accent resulting from combinations of final vowels, x 10,12,16 17, xx 1,5,9,11, resulting nasalization, x 11

2 *Initial vowels*

initial vowel lengthened, iii 15 —loss of *a* after final *e* or *o*, ix 13 xi 1, detail of cases of loss and exceptions xi 2–19, xii 1–8 resulting accent, xii 9–11, xx 4,10 —*ṛ* to *ar* in special case, v 9

3 *Final consonants*

surd to nasal before nasal, viii 2, to sonant before all other sonant letters, viii 3, and, in a special case, before *m*, viii 4, to aspirate before spirant, xiv 12,13

visarjanīya to spirant before surds, ix 2–6, except before *ksh*, ix 3, to *sh* before *t*, in certain cases, vi 5 —omitted before spirant and surd mute, ix 1, also in *sa* etc, v 15–17, also before *r*, viii 7 16,17, special case before *r*, viii 18–22 —changed to *r*, viii 6, do after *a* and *ā*, viii 8–15, exceptional cases, v 10 —changed to *s* or *sh* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, in compound words, viii 23, do in independent words, viii 24–35, exceptions, viii 32,33 —*ah* final to *o*, before *a* and sonants, ix 7,8, special exception viii 18–22, before other vowels ix 10, *āh* final, ix 9,10

final mutes *n* doubled before vowel, ix 18, *n* before *s*, *sh*, v 32 —*t* before *s*, *sh*, v 33 —*t* before palatals, v 22,23, before *l*, v 25 before *ç*, v 22 —*n* before palatals, v 20,21,24,37, xv 1–3, before *t*, vi 11, xv 1–3, before *l*, v 25,26, 31, xv 1–3, before *ç*, v 24, before *s*, *sh*, v 33, changed to *r* or *y* [i e to *anusvara*, xv 1–3] ix 20–24, doubled before vowel, ix 19 —*m* before mutes and semivowels, v 27–31, xiii 3, before spirants and *r*, xiii 1 2, xv 1–3 unchanged before *rā*, xiii 4, special case of loss, v 18

4 *Initial consonants*

ç to *ch*, v 34–7 —*s* to *sh*, in words independent or compound, v 10, vi 1,2,4 6–13 —*t* to *t* vii 13 —*h* after a mute, v 38–41 —*n* to *n*, vii 2,4

elision of initial *m*, v 12, of *v*, v 13, of *s*, v 14

5 *Interior consonants*

t, *th* to *t*, *th* vii 13,14 —*n* to *n* in same word with its cause, xiii 6–9,11,13–15, in other word, vii 3,5,6–12,15,16 —*s* to *sh*, vi 3 —*l* to *d*, xiii 16

6 *Abnormal insertions and elisions duplication, etc*

insertion of *s* v 4–7, of *d*, v 8, of surd mute between sibilant and mute, xiv 9–11, of nasal counterparts (*yamas* and *nāsikya*), xxi 12–14, of *svarabhakti*, xxi 15–16

elision of initial *m*, *v*, *s*, see Initial consonants — in composition of forms of *eka*, v 18,19

duplication in consonant groups, xiv 1–7,14–28, of initial *ch kh*, *bh* in certain cases, xiv 8

IV Sundries

enumeration and specification of cases of *n*, otherwise than euphonic, in interior of words, xiii 9,10,12, of *anusvara*, do do, xv 4,5, xxvi 2–31

requirements in a scholar or teacher, xxiv 5,6

INDEX OF CITATIONS

MADE IN THE COMMENTARY, FROM THE TAITTIRIYA SANHITÂ

This Index contains the references reported above in the body of the work, as made by the commentator to the fundamental text If, however, a cited word or passage is reported as occurring more than once in the text, reference is given only to the first occurrence It has been found impracticable to carry out any scheme of distinction of the value of the citations, and any one using the Index will have to turn back to the notes in order to determine whether a given passage is quoted merely as an example of some general class, or as one that was more or less probably had directly in view, as example or counter example, by the makers of the treatise, whether it is a unique phrase, or one more than once repeated, or even a word of frequent occurrence—and so on

GENERAL INDEX

The references by Roman and Arabic figures together are, as in the other Indexes, to chapter and rule, those by Arabic figures alone (with *p* prefixed), to page of the volume

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

PART of these emendations are due to Prof Weber, who has called my attention to them in private communications A few slight misprints, of obvious character, are not noted here

p **2,** l 25 The MS used by Weber was another (No 504) in the same collection containing only the text (incomplete) of the Pratiçakhya

p **3,** l 1 Dr Rost's description of these MSS has not yet appeared It appears, however that the rules of the Pratiçakhya are read interspersed in the commentary also, as well as prefixed to it in a body (with separate paging)

p **3,** l 4 The differences of reading in the Pratiçakhya text itself are more numerous than is here stated They have been pointed out in the course of the work (either in the notes on the rules, or in the various readings to the comment)—namely, as occurring (with here and there an addition, omitted in its proper place) in i 61, ii 17,51, iv 11,39 (T W *ahne* for *'hne*) v 13,20 (G M *rakaraç*, for *ram* a mere blunder), vii 8 (G M *yajush*, for *yajuh*), 12, viii 8 (T, it should be added, has dropped both *sanuta* and *stanuta*), 13,35, ix 21,22 x 11 (T W B O *anunasikam*, for *'nun*), 13 (G M *pa asiparo budhniya jya a pusha aminanta arshe*, which is perhaps the more acceptable reading, since it gives the uncombinable finals their uncombinable quality in the rule also), 22, xi 16 (G M *adabdhasa* and *ashadhah*, with unelided *a*), 17 (G M *ahmyâ mâ "mbalı*), 18,19 (G M repeat the whole rule, instead of its last two words only) xii 4,9 (T O *asmin*, for *tas*), xiii 4,13,14 (see farther on), 15, xiv 3,8 (G M *upasargai ca patha* a blunder only), 13,32, xvi 1,5 (G M *çanstan unant-* a blunder), 7,13 (G M omit *pipiva* in the rule, as well as its example in the comment, but they give the word in the rehearsal at the beginning of the comment) 16,19,22 26, xvii 2,4, xviii 5 (T *svaritaç ca pl*), xx 9 (G M substitute in the text MS rule xvii 6, except the word *paushkarasadeh*), xxi 5,6,14, xxii 7 (W O also have *shakah* in the rule, but not in the comment), xxiii 2,6,10,12,14,20, xxiv 4 The reading adopted for rule xiii 14 is that of T G M (save that T has *shtha* for *shna*, and *râvnna*, with *virama* under the *v*, and G M have *ravinna* in the text-MSS, and *rârâvnna* in the MSS with comment), W gives *rnn shan shta mna ravn* (with *virâma* under both *v* and *n*), for O the collator has noted nothing, B reads *rn shan shna mna ravn gravna* Other evident copyists' errors occur, of too little account to be worth notice

A reading has been adopted contrary to the authority of all the MSS at ix 1,20 (where the MSS reading is *ikâr aûkârap-*), xi 1,17 The writing of *inqya* for *ingya* was noted under i 48

p **9,** l 16 The commentator, as will be seen under xxi 14, interprets out of existence the *nâsikya* as an independent element

p **11,** l 7 The structure of *r* is defined by the commentator under xxi 15

p **18,** l 12 The commentator refers to some "different reading" (perhaps in his Çikshâ? there is no trace of it in the Pratiçâkhya), beginning *pra para 'pa sam*, but declares it to have to do only with the addition to all these words of *iti* (in the *pada* text, namely, which writes *e 'ti* for *â*, *ape 'ti* for *apa*, and so on) and not to their receiving the name *upasarga* I still fail to see any reason for the limitation of the class to half its usual number

p **23,** l 13 Dele the hyphen at the end of the line

p **33,** l 16 One may conjecture that rule 43 formerly concluded the treatment of accent in this chapter, and applied to all the three kinds of accent, but, rules 44–7, on the circumflex, being later interpolated, the connection made it necessary to understand this also as applying to the circumflex alone

p **34,** rule 46 The same example (from iii 3 11 i) is quoted by the comment under this rule as under rules 43 and 47

p **37,** l 19 Compare under rules xvi 26,29, where this claim is distinctly made But it is not entirely well founded, for there are cases where combinations of sounds which are *padas* are quoted as *padaikadeças* thus *han* in vii 11, *pu* in xvi 2, *hi* in xvi 13, etc

p **42**, ll 28,32,43, read iv 23 (for iv 25)

p **46**, l 3 Read (in part of the edition) *alteration* for *nasalization*

p **82**, last line Restore (in part of the edition) the lost figure 6 before *na*, at the beginning of the line

p **83**, l 2 The passage is found at iv 1 51

p **87**, rule 5 For *aghá*, in rule and translation read *adya*, and the example on the next page, is *adyavád* (p *adya* (*vad*) The St Petersburg lexicon (in the Appendix) has this word in its proper form, but I unfortunately overlooked it

p **88**, l 28, and p **99**, l 5 No division is made of *pravanga* in *pada* text

p **96**, l 28 Read *kah* for *kah* (in part of the edition)

p **101**, l 20 I have little or no doubt that the interpretation here suggested is the true one

p **103**, l 7 from below *To* is not an independent word see the St Petersburg lexicon, s v *totah*

p **104**, l 24 So far as the vocatives in *o* are concerned the existing *pada* text appears to accord with the Pratiçakhya we have them with *iti* as *pragrahas*, for example, at i 3 81,147, 4 27, and without *iti* at i 2 132 4 39 But *o uto*, *upo*, and *pro* are followed by *iti* wherever they occur (for *to* see the preceding correction), although this is not authorized by the Pratiçakhya

p **110**, l 32 The *pada* text divides *dyava prthivi*

p **121**, ll 23,24 Read (in part of the edition) *andraagni* and *indraagni*

p **123**, l 18 Insert the omitted example *hime prata idathe antar esham* (ii 1 115)

p **124**, l 12 Read (in part of the edition) *patam* for *patam*

p **132**, l 15 But note the case reported under i 59 (p 43)

p **138**, l 13 Read (in part of the edition) *nica* (for *nica*)

p **153**, l 27 I have omitted part of the passages in which *t* occurs before *sh*, namely vi 6 11 1,2 vii 2 87 It should have been added, too, that the Sanhitâ furnishes no example of *n* before *sh*

p **157**, l 23 The citation is from vi 3 31, as under the two preceding rules

p **160**, l 24 This is not correct, so far as the existing *pada* text is concerned I was not aware at the time of writing the note that that text treated the *avagraha* pause as suspending the continuance of accentual influence (see p 369, first marginal note) The application of the rule, however, is as stated, compound words having been already provided for by rule 2

p **167**, l 14 The peculiarity of accentuation referred to in the preceding correction would allow of these examples being brought under rule 4

p **173**, l 20 Read *parânuttyâi*

p **176**, rule 11, translation Read *havani*

p **179**, l 12 The suggestion of *punarukti* here is not well founded, the sphere of action of the rules in this and in the thirteenth chapter being different

p **183**, l 10 *Ahorâtre pârçve* is found in Tâitt Âraṇyaka, at iii 13 2

p **193**, ll 9,10 References should have been given for the words *ahorâtrâbhyâm* and *ahorâtrayoh*, the former is found at ii 1 73 et al, the latter at vi 1 31 *Adhishavane* occurs only at vi 2 114

p **194**, l 14 The reference for *rukmo antar* is iv 1 104 5 et al

p **199**, l 9 from below The *pada* text leaves *bṛhaspati* undivided, so that the combination does not come within the ken of the treatise at all

p **199**, l 13 from below Read (in part of the edition) ii 1 57 for ii.1 57

p **205**, l 14 The omission of *h* before a spirant followed by a sonant consonant, here referred to as a doctrine held in schools of the Black Yajus, is practised in the manuscripts of our treatise and its commentary to a degree far beyond what can be regarded as merely accidental G M observe it almost without exception, and it prevails also in the others

p **209**, rule 7 Doubtless *aksarâo* is to be understood here as an adjective, qualifying *visarjaniyah* understood, '*h* completed to *ah*' as the comment clearly intends. This also removes the difficulty of *anuvṛtti* spoken of on pp. 210–11, so far as the implication of *visarjaniyah* is concerned

p **216**, l 2 Read *is* for *does*

p **218**, l 5 The example *paçun* etc occurs first at i 5 21.

p **222**, l 12 Read (in part of the edition) *'gne 'vimán* (for *-mân*).

p **224**, l 4 Read *Also* for *Nor*

p **232**, l 26 I have noted here all the cases in which the *samhita* text shows *dha*, *ma*, or *pa* before *asi*, it appears, however, from Weber's edition of the Sanhitâ, that a part of them have *h* in *pada* text after the *a*

p **233**, l 11 from below Read (in part of the edition) *prape 've* (for *pa*)

p **239**, l 6 Read *o* for *a*

p **265**, l 5 The combination *urdhvo asthat* is in fact read first at iv 2 14, in an *ukhya* passage

p **265**, l 10 There is, however a case in which *a* is omitted according to the general rules, when by the letter, though not the spirit of i 61 it ought to be retained, see under i 61 (p 47)

p **273**, rule 12 I should doubtless have done better to adopt the reading *ramyâya* (for *ban*), in rule, version, and example

p **291**, l 24 *Achavakah* is found at vii 1 5[5]

p **296**, l 9 Read *hkshn* (by ix 3), and this would change the treatment of the group, since *h* (i 9) is not a spirant

p **301**, l 3 Read *hksh*, *hkshn*, *hkshv* (by ix 3), so that *jihvamuliya* occurs only in the four remaining groups

p **302**, l 23 I can give no reference for *varshubhyah*, the reading at vii 4 13 being *varshyabhyah svaha 'varshyabhyah*

p **303**, l 9 I was heedless enough here to overlook the fact that a spirant never stands, according to the rules of this chapter, before either an aspirated surd or a nasal, since a first mute (by rule 9, above) is always inserted in such cases between the two The groups *çch* etc therefore, would be read according to this rule *çcch*, instead of *ccch* The groups in which a nasal originally follows the spirant will be found catalogued under rule xxi 12 (p 390) The example *tasmad* etc, below, is therefore no counter example, and it is G M that are in the wrong in so calling it, it is to be read *taspmat*, according to Plakshi etc, instead of *tasspmat* (or, with *yama*, *tassppmat*)

p **304**, l 5 See also under xxi 16

p **308**, l 6 from below Read *dhakare* for *ra*

p **315**, l 10 Prof Hadley's paper may be found printed in full in the Transactions of the American Philological Association (vol i, 1871, p 1 ff)

p **334**, l 7 Read vii 5 15[2] (for vii 5 14[2])

p **336**, l 7 "Verbal forms"—that is, of course, all excepting *rishi*

p **354**, ll 17,25 See p 426 Prof Roth's MS also ends with *samudrah*, he calls my attention, further, to the passage in the Brhad Âranyaka (i 1 2) *samudra evá 'sya* [i e *açvasya*] *bandhuh samudro yonih*

p **356**, l 3 For *dhrta* as synonym of *pracaya*, see below, under xxiii 17 (p 412)

p **364**, l 24 And accordant, it may be added, with the practice followed in the Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâ, where there is no added figure, and no prolongation of the vowel

p **369**, marg notes, l 6 The *anudatta* mark under *çu* (the second time) has fallen out

p **373**, l 1 Read i 2 5[1] (for i 2 5[2])

p **386**, l 18 The *e* sign has broken off in the *samhitá*-reading of *ágne*

p **387**, l 7 I have considered this point more fully in a paper on the Sanskrit accent in the Transactions of the Am Philological Association (vol i, 1871, p 20 ff)

p **414**, l 4 Read (in Devanâgari) *kramavik*, for *kramivak*- (altered in the type, by some mishap, after the last correction)

p **425**, l 29–30 *Achâvâkah* is found at vii 1 5[5]

p **428**, l 37 But see, for the commentary, the additional note above to i 15 (or p. 18)

p **429**, l 26 The *krama*-text is also quoted under ix 24 (p 224) by O alone

p **438**, last line but one Read xvi for xxvi